

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2114. A bill to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2115. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2116. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2117. A bill to establish a war cabinet and to define the jurisdiction and authority thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2118. A bill to provide for universal service and total mobilization during any war in which the United States is now engaged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2119. A bill to provide for the promotion of officers on the retired list of the Army after specified years of service on active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2120. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 514); to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation and study by the Federal Trade Commission of plans and problems with respect to the effective post-war operation of our economic system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to create a committee of peace aims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 151. Resolution to create a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 152. Resolution to investigate curtailment of Government publications; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 153. Resolution providing additional compensation for chief pages of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to perform casual labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the time for which Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River to June 1, 1947; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States favoring the passage of House bill 997 and Senate bill 216; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to its waters and the use thereof by the adjoining States and the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

230. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Miss A. Campbell, of Hillsboro, Tex., favoring House Resolution No. 123; to the Committee on Labor.

231. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Resolution of Local No. 1116, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, opposing the Hobbs antiracketeering bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of Nevada, regarding statehood for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

233. By Mr. WHITE: Senate Joint Memorial No. 6, of the Idaho State Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture.

234. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States of America, State of Washington Legislature, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 997 and Senate bill 216; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

235. By Mr. BARRETT: Memorial of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the time within which the States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River to June 1, 1947; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who putteth down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, Thy providence has led us as a nation across stern and stormy years to the very vestibule of destiny. In spite of our own shortcomings, which we confess with contrition, in this hour of world crisis Thou hast summoned us as trustees of civilization to defend the heritage of the ages and to help create institutions essential to human progress.

More and more may our strength be dedicated to the fulfillment of the ancient commission now put into our hands, to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captive and the opening of prison doors to them that are bound, to build the old wastes, to repair the ruined cities and the desolation of many generations. Forbid that our favored land throned in richness between the seas should in such an hour be tempted to ask "Who is to be the greatest in the coming kingdom of humanity?"

May she be the greatest as she becomes the servant of all.

We ask it in the name of that One who for the joy that was set before Him despised the shame and endured the cross. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 5, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 6, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 158. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes;

S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California;

S. 641. An act to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers; and

S. 739. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and Mr. BLAND, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. O'BRIEN of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2068), making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEATH OF PVT. MAX E. McCLELLAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has just received a message from North Africa advising him of the death of his son, Max E. McClellan, a private soldier in the Army of the United States, who volunteered for service to his country. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all Senators, and all the friends and acquaintances of Senator McCLELLAN, when I say that we deeply sympathize with him in his great loss. I need not say that we are all deeply affected by the

sacrifice made by the Senator's son in behalf of his country in that far off land.

Mr. President, I felt that under these sad circumstances I should like to say this much, and I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members of the Senate in expressing our profound grief over the sad news which has come to our friend the Senator from Arkansas.

CAPT. CLYDE E. HERRING

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from Kentucky has said, I am sure that every friend of former Senator Herring, of Iowa, noted with profound regret the statement in the newspaper this morning that news had come to Mr. Herring that his son, a captain in the American expeditionary forces abroad, had been reported missing in action. Every Member of this body, particularly those of us who served here with Senator Herring, have learned with very deep regret that this outstanding young man, formerly a captain in the Iowa National Guard, has been reported missing in action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I share the feeling the Senator from Missouri has expressed. I had not heard about former Senator Herring's son, or I would have mentioned him in connection with what I said regarding the death of young Mr. McClellan. I appreciate the Senator from Missouri bringing the matter to our attention.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure the Senator would have mentioned the news about young Captain Herring if he had heard the report.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC LAW OF PUERTO RICO—ELECTION OF GOVERNOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Several months ago the Governor of Puerto Rico recommended that the organic law of Puerto Rico be amended so as to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor. This recommendation was brought to me by the Secretary of the Interior with his approval. The Governor's suggestion has been under consideration since that time.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its Territories and island possessions.

Puerto Rico has universal suffrage and an elective legislature which considers and enacts measures governing its internal affairs. Laws enacted by its legislature, however, including laws of purely local concern, have been subject to approval or disapproval by Governors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

In accordance with the general policy of this Government, I recommend to the

Congress that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor, and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and the government of Puerto Rico, respectively.

I have appointed a committee composed of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and of continental residents to advise me concerning changes in the organic law.

The recommendations of this committee will be promptly submitted to the Congress for its consideration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, March 9, 1943.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the President's recommendation is worthy of the consideration of the Senate, and I believe that every desire of the Puerto Ricans which is reasonably possible of attainment should always be considered by this body. However, I cannot escape the belief that the proposal referred to in the message is not going to solve the Puerto Rican problem. I think it might be well for the Congress to begin approaching the inevitable right now, which, in my judgment, would be to give Puerto Rico her independence, retaining for ourselves such naval and military bases as are essential, and granting Puerto Rico for a period of time certain trade preferences in this country equal to those she now enjoys, which would permit her to readjust her internal and external economy to suit the changed condition.

Puerto Rico was won by the United States by conquest. Its people never agreed by any sort of plebiscite to become a part of this country; and I should like to see the Puerto Ricans given their freedom, the right to determine in full their own destiny, subject always, of course, to the retention, with their consent, of military and naval bases on the island of Puerto Rico, for their protection as well as ours, and to give them such help as we could in order to make possible the transition from a state of dependence to a state of independence, as we have done in the case of the Philippine Islands. I should like to see the Puerto Ricans ask for that; I should like to see them go the whole length rather than merely to ask to elect their own Governor. I believe if such a course is taken, an end to the Puerto Rican problem will be reached, and until such a course is taken we will face a perpetual and never-solved problem pending continually before the Congress of the United States as well as with the Puerto Rican people.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 5th instant,

During the last adjournment of the Senate the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project,

and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The VICE PRESIDENT reappointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

The VICE PRESIDENT reappointed the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CLARIFICATION OF FUNCTIONS OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 133) to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BAILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROVISION RELATING TO BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION (S. Doc. No. 17)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 431 aliens whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on January 31, 1943, under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

A letter from the secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Bragg and Fayetteville, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Local Union No. 9, Minneapolis city and county employees, Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require Senate confirmation of appointees to Federal positions with compensation of \$4,500 per annum or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Washington State Department of Social Security Employees, Pierce County, Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require Senate confirmation of appointees to Federal positions with compensation of \$4,500 per annum or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and Naval Establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress respecting the policy of the State of Utah relating to its waters and the use thereof by the adjoining States and the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas in the State of Utah there are rights of immense proportion which have been acquired in reliance upon State laws governing the use of water, and there are many enterprises awaiting development, which is possible only through the use of water; and

"Whereas differences of opinion have arisen regarding the respective rights and powers of the Federal and State Governments to control and administer the use of waters within the several States, with the result that the stability of existing property rights and the future development of the water resources of this State are threatened, and doubt is cast upon the authority of this State to exercise control over such use; and

"Whereas in order to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to litigation, the welfare of this State requires that action be taken to insure interstate comity in the use of water, and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of floodwaters to the end that litigation be avoided and the use and control of water be continued in the manner and under the laws as heretofore exercised: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in session assembled (the Governor concurring therein), That it is the policy of this State of Utah to maintain its jurisdiction and control over the rights to the use of the waters in this State, and to protect such rights as have been established under the laws thereof; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the policy of this State to protect rights to the beneficial use

of water within this State as against threatened uses outside of the State; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the policy of this State to promote harmonious relations with the United States and with other States in respect to the beneficial use of water, and to encourage the making of compacts with respect to such relationship; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senators, and Representatives from the State of Utah, and the Governors of the States of Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Nevada."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.)

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America and the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States enacted Public Law No. 674 as an amendment to the commodity credit provision permitting the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, etc., approved July 22, 1942; and

"Whereas the available evidence indicates Colorado farmers have greatly increased their inventory numbers of livestock and poultry, in accordance with an appeal from Federal officials necessitated by the need for foodstuffs to be used in the war effort; and

"Whereas there exists an ample supply of wheat in storage in the United States, and the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat authorized to be sold, have been sold and no more of such wheat is available for feeding the augmented number of livestock and poultry in the State of Colorado, and such wheat for feeding purposes is sorely needed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to authorize and empower the Secretary of Agriculture to arrange for the sale of additional wheat to the producers of livestock and poultry in the United States in such amounts as to alleviate the present protein feed shortage which has become an emergency threatening the supplies of foodstuffs now vital to the furtherance of the national war effort; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to perform casual labor

"Whereas our American people, collectively as a nation, are waging the greatest all-out contest of all time; and

"Whereas the able-bodied manhood of America is either under arms or engaged in producing the sinews of war; and

"Whereas this has resulted in an acute labor shortage, threatening curtailment of the vital food supplies of our Nation, and increasing the costs of living; and

"Whereas it is next to impossible for old-age pensioners to live on what they are now receiving; and

"Whereas they desire as patriotic American citizens to do their part by contributing to this great war effort to the best of their abilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized, to amend, or at least suspend for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, the present restrictions in the Social Security Act to the end that any person who receives or is eligible to receive old-age assistance shall be permitted to do and perform odd jobs of labor, caretaking, and similar classes of casual work not in the general course of a trade or business, at such rates of pay commensurate with their abilities to perform the same, but in any event, in an amount not to exceed \$25 in any 1 month without being penalized therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to our congressional representatives in the Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to reviews by United States district courts of decisions of Federal boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States

"Whereas the heads of departments, independent establishments, boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States, with the approval of the President of the United States, are vested with various and divers judicial powers over the life, liberty, and property of the people of the several States; and

"Whereas many of the decisions of said commissions and other agencies of the United States are arbitrary, capricious, and result in the taking of property without due process of law; and

"Whereas in most instances the decisions of these men are reviewed by the heads of the several departments of government and from their decisions no appeals can be taken to a court of competent jurisdiction; and

"Whereas the said Federal boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States frequently disregard the law and the facts and arrive at arbitrary and capricious decisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (with the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact legislation permitting appeals to be taken from the decisions of all boards, commissions, and other agencies of the United States to the United States district court in the district wherein the controversy arises, for hearing de novo upon the issues of law and fact; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, and to Representative FRANK A. BARRETT."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to extend the time within which the States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River to June 1, 1947

"Whereas the Congress of the United States by the act of Congress approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 15, 1940 (Public, No. 632, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), has granted authority to the States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

"Whereas said States have diligently endeavored to negotiate such a compact, have appointed commissioners for that purpose and the commissioners did negotiate a tentative compact, which said compact was not approved by the legislatures of said States; and

"Whereas said States desire to continue such negotiations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (with the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact suitable legislation for the purpose of extending the authority granted by the act of Congress approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 15, 1940 (Public, No. 632, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), to June 1, 1947; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, and to Representative FRANK A. BARRETT."

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

Memorial to the Congress of the United States:

"Whereas the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri is now convened in regular session; and

"Whereas this body experiences much difficulty in the execution of the Social Security laws of our State when drawn in conformity with the Federal Social Security Act; and

"Whereas much confusion and dissatisfaction is evidenced on the part of recipients and charges of unfairness and discrimination are rumored, thus casting many reflections upon the officers in charge of the Social Security operations in each county organized under said Social Security Act; and

"Whereas we feel that the fundamental principle of any democracy is vested in the voice of the people; and

"Whereas we believe the strongest counteracting force of political evil is public resentment when based upon the opinion of a well informed constituency; and

"Whereas we feel that exacting of burdensome taxes by any group of appointive officials only to be disbursed also by a like group of appointive officials with the taxpayer being deprived of the right to know who is the beneficiary, one bold step has been made in defiance of the principles of democracy and the American way of life which is the goal for which the greatest war in history is being waged; we therefore memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to the effect that any citizen in any county in any State thus organized under the Federal Social Security Act

may be informed upon request made to his local Social Security Board of the names of any recipients in any branch of the Social Security Department and the respective amounts of money each is receiving, or has received during the past year, and to liberalize the Social Security Act so as to remove the many limitations and conditions placed upon the States before they may obtain Federal funds, also to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 26

"Whereas many Missouri communities are faced with dire economic distress and virtual abandonment due to the failure of national governmental agencies to use the natural resources and manpower of great areas of our State in the war program to the end that our population and economy be stabilized; providing employment near the homes of our people and thereby preventing the current migration of our population to the metropolitan areas where they are now being drawn by lucrative positions in war plants concentrated in those areas; and

"Whereas there are no governmental installations in the whole northern section of the State of Missouri and only four in the southern section, thereby leaving an area greater than that of any of the New England States with the exception of Maine, and having a population greater than that of at least four States in the Union without any governmental installation of any kind; and

"Whereas such Government contracts and installations in the war program in the State of Missouri have been concentrated in the metropolitan areas of St. Louis and Kansas City, the skilled labor from these inland sections has been taken from our communities and farms to live in crowded and less wholesome environmental conditions causing acknowledged housing shortages and because of such concentrations resulting in increased living costs and the needless disruption of homes, thereby increasing the social problems in these metropolitan areas; and

"Whereas the facts disclose that by every comparison our sister States have been more favored than the State of Missouri as for example:

"In the dollar valuation of war contracts per dollar of manufacturing activity in the States as of 1939 Kansas was awarded contracts in the amount of \$16.39 for every dollar of manufacturing activity which she had before the war. Nebraska received contracts equivalent to \$6.38 for every previous dollar that she had in manufacturing before the war. Arkansas received \$6.06. Oklahoma received \$3.02. But Missouri received contracts equivalent to only \$2.91.

"In the all-over value of war contracts thus far awarded the national per capita average is \$710.85. Our sister to the west, Kansas, has received from a bounteous government in war contracts a per capita average of \$1,083.21 as compared with a per capita average in Missouri with her two large cities included of \$452.24.

"As of September 30, 1943, war contracts had so changed the rank of our States in their relative manufacturing positions that we find Kansas advanced 15 places in the rank of manufacturing among the States.

"Oklahoma has bettered her position 6 places among the 48 States, Arkansas and Nebraska likewise are in an improved rank and though Missouri has always been further advanced in manufacturing than any of these she has, during the same period, fallen from her former position so that she has lost 5 places in her manufacturing rank with the other States; and

"Whereas Missouri is unselfishly furnishing her share of her youth to the Nation's armed forces and desires further to place her manpower and other resources to work in the war effort, and it seems incredible that such vast resources of men and natural materials cannot be employed within the area, not only to stabilize the present economy of the State but to provide a great employment opportunity for our young men in service when they return after victory; inasmuch as such installations could then be converted to peacetime operations as now planned in the sister States which have thus far been favored; and

"Whereas it has been the enunciated policy of our National Government to provide every possible means of securing the production of war matériel with a minimum of disruption and dislocation of the family life, the foundation of our democratic way, it then seems to us reasonable that more careful consideration of sites, facilities, labor, and resources of this State should be given by the agencies of our Government in Washington charged with the responsibility of locating these essential war enterprises: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri, That we call upon the elected representatives of the people of our State in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and upon such other of our citizens in Washington as now hold offices of high trust, upon our elected State officials, and upon the commercial and civic leaders of all sections of the State that they act in concerted unison to bring these facts and these conditions to the attention of the President of the United States and to all departments and agencies of the Government dealing with the problems of securing war matériel, the acquiring of facilities, the establishing of training bases and the installation of war production units, to the end that the great State of Missouri may contribute in larger measure to the war effort and that her people and her resources may be fully utilized in speeding our Nation's effort to victory; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be placed in the hands of our representatives in Washington, our elective State officers and the appropriate departmental, commercial, and civic executives as set forth above."

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution No. 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to relieve all persons in active military service of the United States from payment of income taxes or gross income taxes on their compensation received from the Government for such service

"Whereas the United States is now engaged in the prosecution of war activities on every continent and on the high seas in every corner of the globe against the totalitarian forces of Germany, Italy, Japan, and their satellites; and

"Whereas several million American citizens are aiding the Nation in this titanic struggle, by serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy; and

"Whereas thousands of such loyal and brave Americans have already lost their lives in this war, and those living will expose theirs to the risk of loss of life; and

"Whereas it is difficult for members of the armed forces to devote full energy to the struggle at hand, if they are beset by finan-

cial worries such as the payment of taxes, etc.; and

"Whereas it would be fitting and proper that certain taxes such as net income taxes and gross income taxes imposed by the Federal Government and the various States and Territories of the United States and the political subdivisions thereof not be required of such members of the armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States further amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by exempting all compensation received by persons while on active duty as members of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and all officers of the Public Health Service detailed by proper authority for duty either with the Army or the Navy from the payment of income taxes there- of either net income or gross income, imposed under the authority of the laws of the United States or the laws of any other State or Territory or any public or any political subdivision thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to each Member of Congress from South Dakota, including both Senators and Representatives, and to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress with the request that this matter receive their most earnest consideration."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the honorable the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and the Office of Price Administration of the United States, to oppose any modification of the existing sanitary acts provided for embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meats from countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas were it not for the Federal embargo, foot-and-mouth disease would be the greatest disease menace to the livestock industry of South Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas from time to time a movement has developed to import fresh and frozen meat products from countries infested with foot-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas the most eminent livestock sanitary authorities of this Nation agree that freezing will not surely destroy the germ of foot-and-mouth disease, and

"Whereas an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease would be an incalculable menace to the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That all Federal authorities be urgently requested to oppose any modification of the existing embargo against the importation of fresh and frozen meat products from any and all countries known to be infested with foot-and-mouth disease, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to all representatives in the Congress and Senate of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Bureau of Animal Industry, and to the Office of Price Administration."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the alcohol production plant of the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, of Yankton, S. Dak., with a view of determining the possibility of establishment of a synthetic rubber plant at Yankton, S. Dak.

"Be it resolved by the State Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

"Whereas the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, organized under the laws of the State of South Dakota, with its principal place of business at Yankton, Yankton, County, S. Dak., will, on or after the 1st day of April 1943, be in production of alcohol from corn products; and

"Whereas the operating capacity of the plant of said corporation will be the reduction of approximately 2,000 bushels of corn per day, with a daily output capacity of 6,000 gallons of alcohol; and

"Whereas the production and manufacture of synthetic rubber is of the highest importance to the Nation in the present war emergency: Be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America should investigate the Yankton Industrial Alcohol Corporation, its plant and equipment at Yankton, S. Dak., with a view to determining the advisability and possibility of establishing at Yankton, S. Dak., a synthetic rubber manufacturing plant; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of South Dakota."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing the President and Congress to revise the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the laws and regulations relating to the administration of Indian affairs for the following reasons and along the following lines:

"(a) That most of the said existing laws and regulations were formulated at a time when all the Indians were considered as wards and dependents of the Federal Government and incapable of assuming the duties, obligations, and station of citizenship;

"(b) That most of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation have now been accorded the legal status of citizenship, and have advanced in education and progress along the lines of racial development to a point where they should be treated as full citizens, and most of the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action should be removed;

"(c) That many of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation are now graduates of high schools and colleges, and all of them are capable of receiving full high school and college education;

"(d) That most of our Indian citizens have entered loyally into the present war and assumed the risks and duties of active warfare on the same basis as other citizens of the Nation, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly."

"We therefore earnestly memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to consider the changed condition of Indian affairs and to revise the laws and regulations concerning them accordingly; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the national Congress, and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Dakota; all to be done by the Secretary of State upon the passage and approval of this resolution."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.)

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress concerning the condition of Indians

"Whereas deplorable conditions continue on the Indian reservations of South Dakota, with low living standards, lack of agricultural or other occupations, and impaired health; and

"Whereas these conditions appear to be steadily growing worse instead of better, with the Indian gradually becoming more dependent and more poorly equipped for either a happy or prosperous living, despite increased Federal appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

"Whereas the South Dakota Indian has shown his patriotism and his love for the American flag in the present world crisis: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Indian Bureau recognize its obligations in the postwar period by conducting a thorough study in South Dakota of the Indians' health, living standards, and vocational opportunities, to the end that they may live a happier and more useful life; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to South Dakota Congressmen and to John Collier, Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE—AIR COMMERCE LEGISLATION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present and ask to have appropriately referred a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont relating to Federal legislation affecting air commerce.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration House bill H. R. 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a minor part and private flying and fixed base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the States their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed base operations; and

Whereas by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise if necessary; and

Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time; and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from active duty; and

Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future developments and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulation of aircraft: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Congress be respectfully requested that no favorable action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN, and Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, Senators, and Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Representative, from Vermont.

ASA S. BLOOMER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,

President of the Senate.

Approved March 5, 1943.

WILLIAM H. WILLIS,

Governor.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FARMERS—SUSPENSION OF A. A. A. ACTIVITIES

Mr. BALL presented a resolution of the National Association of Farmers relating to the total suspension of A. A. A. activities for the duration of the war, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has recently raised the restrictions and penalties incidental to production of wheat, thereby admitting the folly of the doctrine of scarcity previously advocated by the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas the present and threatened food shortages have been largely brought about by the insistence of the Department of Agriculture upon restricted production and by its lack of capacity to appreciate and recognize the needs of the farmer as to farm machinery and manpower; and

Whereas there is a manifest tendency to add to the duties and powers of State and local Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees under the guise of war emergency and whereas these additional duties and powers are apparently designed to strengthen and perpetuate the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program; and

Whereas these above-mentioned factors are detrimental to increased farm production and consequently are hampering our whole war effort; and

Whereas these additional duties and powers could be more efficiently performed by local officials elected by popular vote and whereas the method of selection of the present Agricultural Adjustment Administration and allied boards is destructive of public confidence in the operation of said boards: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Association of Farmers, That we recommend to Congress, legislation looking to the total suspension of Agricultural Adjustment Administration activities for the duration of the war, as we feel that the enormous reservoir of manpower now immobilized in Agricultural Adjustment Administration activities would be immensely more valuable if employed in actual farm production.

PAUL F. WARBURTON,

President of Free Farmers of Minnesota.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter dated Homestead, Fla., February 28, 1943, and signed by seven church pastors. I read the letter, as follows:

HOMESTEAD, FLA., February 28, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,

Chairman of the Senate

Military Affairs Committee,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing to you, not personally, but as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate of the United States.

The congregation assembled at a union service at the First Methodist Church at Homestead, Fla., February 28, 1943, requested the undersigned pastors to write to you stating that the congregation desire and urge the passage by Congress of protective legislation for our armed forces—the sons of our homes—from the liquor and vice traffic, similar to that enacted by Congress in 1917 which Secretaries Baker and Daniels both declared to be exceedingly effective.

The congregation also requests that you read this action on the floor of the Senate and have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

O. SEWELL PALMER,

Pastor, Methodist Church.

J. E. JOHNSTONE,

Pastor, First Baptist Church.

R. E. HASTINGS,

Pastor, Church of God.

EARL P. SCOTT,

Church of the Nazarene.

Mr. President, I have complied with their request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter presented by the Senator from North Carolina will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 791. A bill to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named; without amendment (Rept. No. 97).

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McKellar), from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 1975. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation four lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March

6, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 621. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California; and

S. 739. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Etta Houser Freeman; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. REED introduced Senate bill 840, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 841. A bill for the relief of J. P. Woolsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 842. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 843. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 844. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide a minimum annuity of \$50 per month for annuitants who have completed 30 years service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 845. A bill to define the exterior boundaries of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 846. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 847. A bill to provide for certain payments to needy blind individuals;

S. 848. A bill to provide for certain payments to dependent children;

S. 849. A bill to extend provisions of the act of March 20, 1933, and veterans' regulations applicable to World War veterans and dependents to veterans and dependents of the present war, and for other purposes; and

S. 850. A bill to provide for the payment of old-age pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 851. A bill to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 852. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fortified facility at or near the naval depot at Hawthorne, Nev.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 853. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 854. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 855. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide for an

annuity for total and permanent disability after 10 years' service; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 856. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Henry I. Brown; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

APPEALS FROM PRICE-CONTROL ORDERS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes. This is not a farm-bloc bill. This is not in the interest of or of any benefit to the farmer. It is a bill in the interest of the consumer whose supply of food, especially meat, is being threatened by impossible orders issued by the O. P. A., in violation of the plain intent of Congress.

The original Price Control Act of 1942 set up an emergency court of appeals and gave it exclusive jurisdiction over all appeals from orders and regulations of the O. P. A. The difficulty is that policies and practices of the O. P. A. makes appeal almost impossible under existing law. Appeal may be delayed by amendment and change in the orders and regulations, or by requiring additional information before an order is made final. In spite of great dissatisfaction with the many orders of the O. P. A., not a single appeal, so far as my information goes, has been able to reach the emergency court.

This bill provides appeal to any district court having jurisdiction of the parties.

The bill (S. 840) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN DISABLED PERSONS—BILL RECOMMENDED

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 48, Senate bill 180, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise, may be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, together with all amendments which may be pending or on the table relating thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill and amendments will be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him as an amendment to the committee amendment to the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agri-

cultural occupations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McKELLAR) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following:

"Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services: For payments to States for expenditure in accordance with State plans for the wartime care and protection of children of employed mothers, approved by the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, upon recommendation of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, or Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and for payments to subdivisions of States for expenditure in accordance with such plans, such payments to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with certification to him by any office of the Government designated for such purpose by the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, fiscal year 1943, \$2,884,000: *Provided*, That any plan so approved shall itemize by classes and amounts the total funds required for the plan and the amount of Federal funds requested; shall provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the efficient operation of the plan; shall set out a schedule of fees to be charged; shall state the extent of State and local participation in providing necessary funds, facilities, and services; shall provide for the inclusion and financing of any projects for care of children of employed mothers, now financed in whole or in part from Federal funds, upon the expiration of existing Federal grants, when such projects are essential to the prosecution of the war; and the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services shall not approve any plan except upon his determination that the schedule of fees is the maximum practicable in view of the wages paid in the areas served, and his determination that the State and local participation is adequate in view of the financial status of the State or subdivisions: *Provided further*, That payments shall not exceed 50 percent of the total estimated expenditures, including expenditures from fees received, but excluding expenditures for purchase, renovation, construction, repair, or equipment of any building or premises in excess of \$1,000 for each project: *Provided further*, That no payment from this appropriation shall be available for the purchase or erection of buildings; for alteration, repair, and equipment for any single project in excess of \$1,000; or for operating expense, alteration, repairs, or equipment except in areas with special needs because of substantial increase in employment of women arising out of the war: *Provided further*, That the term "States" as used herein shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii: *Provided further*, That any equipment which is under the control of the Federal Works Agency and which is necessary to a project for the care of children of employed mothers already in operation and in use at the time such project is placed under this program may be transferred for the purposes hereof to other Federal agencies as the Director of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services may prescribe, and the appraised value thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, and other Federal agencies upon transfer thereto in accordance herewith, in connection with the foregoing approval of plans and payments to States, including personal services in the District of Columbia; actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, without other compensation from the United States, while away from their homes in an advisory capacity to the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services; and printing and binding; fiscal year 1943, \$89,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100."

Page 6, after line 1, insert the following:

"BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION

"Notwithstanding the limitations in section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, the appropriation for the Board of Investigation and Research contained in said act shall be available for travel expenses and printing and binding in amounts not exceeding \$11,000 and \$23,000, respectively."

Page 8, after line 24, insert the following:

"Emergency preparation of high-school students for wartime service, Office of Education (national defense): For payments to States through certification from time to time by the United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") to the Secretary of the Treasury of the name of each State to which payment is to be made and the amount to be paid, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the President, such payments to be made prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, as follows:

"(1) For assistance to the States in adjusting the organization and curriculum of the high schools to a program for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service, such assistance to consist of (1) medical examination of students, and (2) the improvement of teachers in service in the fields of physical education, aeronautics, science, and mathematics through local district teacher-training institutes, demonstrations, visitations, publication, and other means; as provided by State departments of education pursuant to plans submitted by them and approved by the Commissioner, fiscal year 1943, \$2,390,000: *Provided*, That each State department and local board of education shall continue to expend, on an annual basis, such sums as it has spent therefor in the year preceding the enactment hereof.

"(2) For assistance to State departments of education in providing State administration and instructional services in adjusting the organization and curriculum of the high schools to a program for the preparation of youth for wartime service, such administrative and instructional services to include salaries of State directors of a High School Victory Corps, of supervisors of physical fitness, aeronautics, mathematics, science, and occupational information and war service counseling, and of clerical and stenographic services; necessary travel expenses; and printing; in accordance with plans submitted by State departments of education and approved by the Commissioner, fiscal year 1943, \$678,000: *Provided*, That the State departments of education shall continue to expend for such purposes, on an annual basis, such amounts from State funds as were available therefore in the year preceding the enactment hereof.

"Salaries and expenses, emergency preparation of high-school students for wartime

service, Office of Education (national defense): For all expenses necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out the foregoing program for the emergency preparation of high-school students for wartime service, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, printing and binding, not to exceed \$7,500 for the payment of actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner, fiscal year 1943, \$114,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$100: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner shall transmit to Congress within 30 days after the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, a report of the emergency program for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service as provided for in this act, such report to show the distribution of Federal funds by States, types of expenditures, and numbers of persons involved."

Page 21, after line 9, insert the following:

"CHILDREN'S BUREAU

"Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care: For grants to States, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, to provide, in addition to similar services otherwise available, medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces of the United States of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades, under allotments by the Secretary of Labor and plans developed and administered by State health agencies and approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau, fiscal year 1943, \$1,200,000."

Page 25, line 24, after the figure "\$491,000", insert the following: "": *Provided*, That cost of living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder."

Page 28, after line 8, insert the following:

"Special melting and coinage: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes", approved December 18, 1942 (Public Law 815), the expenses or adjustments in connection with the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars shall be charged against the gain arising from the coinage of such bars."

Mr. HAYDEN also (for Mr. McKellar) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. McKellar to House bill 1975, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1943, which were severally referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

MULTIPLE SHIP LAUNCHINGS IN
SUPERIOR, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a group of workers in the shipyards of Superior, Wis., stating that on May 9 they would launch from five to eight ships. The letter states that this will be a world record for multiple launchings. It is expected that the Dionne quintuplets will be present, and the Lakes Ship Builders Joint Council is preparing for a great celebration. I ask that the letter

of the head of the Lakes Ship Builders Joint Council, together with my reply, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAD OF THE LAKES
SHIPBUILDERS JOINT COUNCIL,
Superior, Wis., March 4, 1943.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Local shipyards in Superior will launch from five to eight ships on May 9. This should achieve a world record for multiple launchings in one port on one day. To celebrate this event, the Dionne quintuplets will make their first visit to the United States in order to sponsor five sister ships in a "quint" launching at the Butler yards, and the local Shipbuilders Council, representing union labor, has declared that May 9 will be Labor Victory Day.

It is the hope of our committee that Labor Victory Day will commemorate a real day of victory in the battle of production, and a day of which laboring men everywhere will be proud. In the past labor has received some unpleasant publicity, but on this day, it is our hope, labor will receive some recognition of its cooperation with management. Here in Superior, for example, there has not been one strike, nor one work stoppage in our entire shipbuilding war effort. As a consequence, our shipyards are far ahead of production schedules, and, in addition, the shipbuilding unions have established an enviable record in the purchase of war bonds.

To make Labor Victory Day amount to something more than just another name-observance day, to give it some tangible expression, all shipbuilding employees will donate one full day's wages into a fund for the purchase of a shipload of food for war-stricken Europe. We estimate that this fund should approximate \$50,000, and it is our hope that one of the "quint" ships may be secured to carry this cargo, thus underlining the fact that the supplies are from the workmen of Superior to the starving families of oppressed workmen in Europe. In this connection we have a real need for your support.

In general, we would appreciate any publicity which you may be able to give our enterprise. In particular, we would like you to approach the national headquarters of the International Red Cross on our behalf. Will you kindly advise us of their attitude? Finally, though we are willing to turn the whole problem of transportation over to the Red Cross, we definitely feel that local community support would be stronger, and the publicity value greater, if we could secure one of the "quint" ships. These freighters from the Butler yards happen to be earmarked under lend-lease for Great Britain. After consultation with the Red Cross, we would appreciate your contacting the British lend-lease officials, the American State Department, or any responsible parties who would be in a position to give us an opinion on the feasibility of this plan.

Though we realize that this is asking you to do a great deal, we believe that you will agree it is for a worthy cause, and we assure you of our genuine appreciation for anything you may do for us.

Respectfully yours,

HOLDER MODEEN,
Chairman, Superior Shipbuilders Council.

MARCH 8, 1943.

MAJ. RALPH W. OLMSTEAD,
Deputy Director, Food Distribution
Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR OLMSTEAD: Pursuant to our telephone conversation I am attaching herewith a self-explanatory letter which I received this morning from the Superior Ship-

builders Council, 1005 Tower Avenue, Superior, Wis.

You will recall I discussed this matter with you in a telephone conversation and you assured me the matter could be arranged in accordance with the request outlined in this letter.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson and also to Lease-Lend Administrator E. R. Stettinius, and War Shipping Administrator E. S. Land.

As I understand it from my telephone conversation with you, it will not be necessary for these men to take any action since your department can handle the matter in its entirety. I am, however, sending them copies of the letter from the Superior Shipbuilders Council together with this letter so they may be fully advised in the event you may have to call on them for cooperation.

I regard this matter as extremely urgent, and I would greatly appreciate having a reply by telephone as soon as you can give me definite information or assurance these plans can be carried out.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

SLOGAN AGAINST ABSENTEEISM BY MISS
CAROL GRAGG

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the Cessna Aircraft Co., of Wichita, Kans., has been doing an excellent job of production in the war effort. I am informed that its campaign to reduce absenteeism has been attended with remarkably successful results.

As a part of its campaign against absenteeism, the Cessna plant held a contest for the best slogan. More than 1,000 slogans were entered. The winner of the contest was Miss Carol Gragg, a war worker in the electrical department of the plant. The splendid original slogan she suggested is this:

"You can't spell victory with an absent-T."

I think the slogan is pat, to a Tee, as we used to say. I am glad to call the attention of the Senate to Miss Carol Gragg, of the Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans., and hope that her slogan, "You can't spell victory with an absent-T" does its bit toward victory.

GOVERNMENT BY REGIMENTATION AND
BUREAUCRACY—ARTICLE BY WALTER
E. CHRISTENSON

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 25, I addressed the Senate relative to a nomination the confirmation of which was resisted by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

In my remarks I stated that those of us who came from Nebraska came on a mandate from the people that we should cooperate with the President in the war effort 100 percent, but also that we should oppose to the utmost a government by regimentation and bureaucracy. As I said at that time, this mandate was given to us in no uncertain terms, and in the brief remarks I made to the Senate I called attention to my belief in the fundamental principles of representative government. I advised that these principles were reflected by the people of my State, and that it has been my experience that they extend quite generally into the other Midwestern States.

Since then an article has been written by Walter E. Christenson, an associate

editor of the Omaha World Herald, which sets forth in forceful and dramatic language the ideology of government of our Nebraska people and, I would say, of the voters of the Middle West.

I ask unanimous consent that this splendid article by Mr. Christenson be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECAY OF LIBERALISM—THE CITIZEN VERSUS EXECUTIVE DECREE

(By W. E. Christenson)

To some people liberalism means Eugene Debs; to some it means George Norris; to some it means Joe Stalin; and to some it means Franklin Roosevelt.

To me it doesn't mean any of those, but it means a lot of people who, through the ages, have been leading the fight for the liberty of human beings—and particularly those who have been fighting against enslavement of people by their government.

It's nothing new. Dionysius said, "A love of liberty is implanted by nature in the breasts of all men." Tacitus wrote, "Liberties and masters are not easily combined." Thirteen centuries later William Wallace said to the Scots, "I tell you true liberty is the best of all things; never live beneath the noose of a servile halter."

But while this feeling for liberty appears to be almost universal, it flourishes more luxuriantly on American soil than anywhere else on the globe. The reasons are not obscure. From the earliest settlements our country has been populated and repopulated by fugitives from tyranny. And when the time came for separation, it is noteworthy, I believe, that the colonists in their bill of complaint did not dwell on physical hardships. They did not say, "You have not protected us from the Indians," or "You have not taken care of our old people," or "You haven't allowed us to have enough tea." The thing that caused them to rebel was that they were being treated as inferiors and dependents. They were revolting against the usurpations of the king and the violations of their liberties.

"He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary * * * He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly * * * He has made judges dependent on his will alone * * * He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance * * * He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution * * *

The colonists were fighting, not the particular brain trust which happened to be in power in London at that moment, but a totalitarian system.

ECONOMIC DESPOTISM OUR NEW TYRANNY

The war against the mother country was won, but the battle for human liberty did not end. It continued until our own times.

But when the decades arrived which most of us look back upon as the days of our youth—the decades which marked the turn of the twentieth century—the nature of the battle had changed. Political authoritarianism had been vanquished, we thought, for all time. But in its place there had come a sort of economic despotism which many free Americans found no less galling than earlier types of tyranny. The natural wealth of the land had been plundered to a considerable extent by the robber barons who flourished after the Civil War. Great wealth and great economic power became concentrated in a few hands. Workers in great industrial centers were ground down into a state of ser-

vility. The historical avenue of escape—flight to the west—narrowed and finally closed as the cheap land was occupied.

That was when modern liberalism was born.

Most westerners were liberals in those days. We were the sons of wild jackasses, we had the breath of freedom in our nostrils, and we didn't want to see ourselves or our children shackled into an industrial class system of society. We wanted to live in a republic in which there was real opportunity for all—economic opportunity as well as political opportunity. We wanted every child, even if born in the humblest home, to have a chance to become a congressman or a president or a chairman of the board—according to the stuff there was in him.

Our thoughts in those days were largely concerned with what we called the trusts and the malefactors of great wealth; with swindlers who impudently sold worthless stocks; with manipulators who threw great railroad systems into bankruptcy so that they might plunder them; with sweatshops and company stores and kick-backs and black-lists and insolently juggled tariffs and adulterated food and short weight and all the other manifold evils that had attached themselves to the economic and political system.

WE DID NOT TIRE OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

But let this point be made—to borrow a phrase—"again and again." Most of us were not tired of individual liberty; we wanted more of it. We wanted the rules of living in a free land to be changed a little so that we, the people, would be more secure in our freedom and less endangered by the irresponsible authority of autocrats.

It is only fair to say that there were crackpots in the liberal movement—socialists, anarchists, syndicalists and "ists" of many stripes who even then were thinking in terms of a dictatorship of the proletariat. But they were an insignificant minority. The great American liberal movement was libertarian in its aims and constitutional in its methods. Nothing was further from its purpose than a return to the days when bureaucrats swarmed over the land, eating the substance of the people.

Ten years ago American liberalism thought it had won its greatest political victory. But as time was to prove, that was in reality its hour of greatest danger.

For the men and women who crowded into places of power in the next decade were not in every case believers in the traditional American concept of liberty. They were not in every case well grounded in the practical mechanics of modern society. There were experimenters in their ranks, and uplifters and social workers and dreamy-eyed doers of good—and a few zealots who had borrowed their ideas from other climes and non-American cultures.

"Liberalism," so-called, was in the saddle, but it was not the pure, historical American liberalism. In too many instances it had overtones of the other kinds of isms then being advocated in Europe.

OVER-ALL TREND TOWARD ARBITRARY AUTHORITY

The strange thing about this new, left-wing, self-styled liberalism was that it proposed to set up bureaucratic government controls, backed by executive directives, to preserve the liberties of the people. The founding fathers would have turned in their sacred graves if they had heard such heresy.

Perhaps the harassed businessman when he accepted the temporary shelter of the National Recovery Act, the farmer when he took a Federal check for what he had raised or had not raised, the humble Work Projects Administration worker when he thanked Washington for his pittance, did not have time to think about the fundamental conflict involved. But the conflict was there, as clearly etched as ever it had been in his-

tory: The Taxpayer versus the Bureaucrat, the Citizen versus the Executive Decree.

This is not an indictment of an administration. It should be said in fairness that many items in the program of the New Deal were beneficial changes in the rules—changes designed to permit the average American a chance to lead a better and more useful and freer life.

But the over-all trend of the decade has been toward strengthening the arbitrary authority of the State. The power of the courts has been assailed and the power of the Congress has been usurped and bypassed. Today no prudent attorney would dare to advise a client on any matter relating to the economic life of the Nation merely on the basis of what he could find in the statutes or in his volumes of judicial opinions. More important by far than these are the decrees and directives which come from the bureaucracy, and the rulings thereon which have been handed down by various ones of 2,500,000 civil employees of the Central Government.

THEIR GOAL SECURITY BUT NOT LIBERTY

It is argued that a vast extension in the authority of the Government is necessary in time of war to make the Nation more efficient and more productive. On that point we should be particularly careful to think clearly.

The American people do not object to the discipline demanded by total war or to the so-called hardships which result for the civilian population. A temporary lack of gasoline or rubber or shoes or coffee or whatever is trivial incident in the life of a Nation. But the kind of government that may result from these strictly temporary conditions—that is a matter of the deepest interest to all of us and to our children. What is happening today should be viewed in the light of what has gone before and what is promised for the future. And that view is not entirely reassuring.

These former liberal brethren who are now in authority in Washington had charted their course long before total war had imposed its demands upon the Nation. They had said in substance: "Our goal is security. Not liberty, but security. We are going to see to it that everyone, the shirker equally with the toiler, has plenty to eat and a comfortable place in which to live. It is not our purpose merely to create a society in which all will have a fair chance to produce and earn. We propose to take charge of society, we propose to direct its economic operations in such a way that the social objectives which we in our wisdom deem proper shall be guaranteed to every citizen by the central authority."

And if the voice of Benjamin Franklin cried from the tomb: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety"—if that voice was raised, surely no one in all the land heard.

THE ROAD FRANCE TROD

We moderns have a tragic illustration before us of what may happen if the search for national leisure and security—under the auspices of a bureaucracy—is carried to an extreme. In his report on the reasons for the fall of France, General Giraud, our present aide and ally, spoke realistically of conditions within that country before the war. He said:

"It was easier to succeed by intrigue than work. Politics became a career of compromise, arrangement, betrayal. Many lawyers, professors, and journalists suddenly believed themselves statesmen, as soon as they had taken their first degree—but above all, as soon as they had managed to get into the office of some undersecretary of state, or into the reception room of some woman of importance.

"From 1918 to 1940 France luxuriated in every kind of regime that might be called

republican—from horizon blue to the Red popular front. Ministries fell like houses of cards, scandals accumulated, riots caused the spilling of French blood even on the paving stones of the capital; but always the same men trod the boards. The ruin which the popular front caused France is immeasurable, but its greatest responsibility was to teach the people of France laziness under the grandiose name of leisure."

In a similar report, issued sometime before France was destroyed, two Premiers of that Republic—the Messrs. Daladier and Reynaud—expressed similar sentiments. They said:

"Actually that part of the French population which created wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which, directly or indirectly, lives on the state is constantly growing. * * * There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation. * * * That everyone should work more and that the state should spend less—for ourselves we see this as the only formula of salvation; it is elementary, but it is inescapable."

WE MUST BRAVE SOME EPITHETS

And at another point this report continues:

"The problem, then, is not to choose between preserving or repealing the recent social reforms, whose generous inspiration nobody disputes. The problem is to prevent them from automatically dwindling to nothing, to prevent their benefits from evaporating in the high cost of living, to prevent employers and employed, in a country which is still poor, from having nothing to share but poverty."

They were writing about France, but their message was for America, too.

It is a little difficult to discuss such matters without seeming to defend some of the piratical practices which attached themselves to our economy during the earlier years of easy prosperity. The one who questions steps taken since 1933 is likely to be answered with, "Oh, so you prefer the Hoover depression." The one who questions the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the bureaucracy is likely to be branded as a tory and a latter-day edition of Mark Hanna. Yet those taunts will have to be braved if we are going to save the kind of personal liberty Americans love.

Only the naive will expect that the law-making and directive-issuing bureaucracy will meekly disband after the war and that its many practitioners will return forthwith to their studies and their social service settlements. So far as I am aware no such miracle has ever transpired in the long record of the struggle between the people and government. Rousseau was speaking for history when he said: "Liberty is never recovered if it is once lost."

"PLANNING" IS NEW WORD FOR DESPOTISM

There are plentiful signs that those former liberals who now are directing the managed economy do not propose to go against the tide of history. They propose, when victory is won, that "planning"—that new word for despotism—shall be carried to new heights.

Only a few weeks ago HENRY A. WALLACE, that most lovable and most amazing of all planners, gave a glimpse of what is running through his mind. In the post-war world, he said, there will be a new type of government which might be called, "the democracy of the common man." And this new democracy, he said, will be made up of approximately equal parts of our traditional (it is his phrase) "Bill of Rights democracy" and the newer—again quoting Mr. WALLACE—"economic democracy" as exemplified in the Government of Soviet Russia.

If economic democracy fits the needs of Russia—whose history and traditions are far

different from our own—then certainly no one in America should utter one word of criticism. Americans have reason to be eternally grateful for the stout Red Army which that economic democracy has produced. But does that mean that we, also, should adopt the democracy of the commissars and the collective farms? That we should consider borrowing for our own use any part of a type of regime whose final authority is based upon the firing squad? Perhaps some Americans will not agree with their Vice President.

Another post-war dreamer who is not an official but who sometimes speaks for the prevailing attitude in Washington, said only a few days ago: "Soviet Russia is now functioning as a complete democracy within an over-all totalitarian scheme."

Possibly as you think it over you may conclude that is a fair statement of the program which some of these totalitarian-minded citizens may have in view.

Any talk about what those now in authority propose in the way of a post-war program for our own country—I am not now speaking of any international organization—must necessarily be speculative. No one has stated it formally. We can only see what is happening, read what is being said—and then use our God-given intelligence.

Perhaps that points to one of the greatest dangers of the times. We are not fighting a tangible program which can be faced and debated, but only an insidious trend. Trends are mighty tricky things to fight, as the people of Germany discovered in 1933.

This would be a grand hour for the old-time, fighting American liberals—if they were still on the scene. But unfortunately the movement in which they once joined is bankrupt. Some of its leaders have been shanghaied and taken on a political cruise which was never charted. Others are tired and dejected. The political power which they built up has been dissipated or subverted to opposite uses. The great American liberal movement which once spread its beneficent influence over both great parties has disappeared.

True, there are political leaders in both parties who take a strong stand agin' what is being done. But if they should be put in power, would they be strong enough morally to junk the enormously powerful and (to the driver) attractive governmental machine that has been created? Historically a mere policy of throwing the rascals out has never been entirely successful.

A demand from a few political leaders can be forgotten after the election; a demand from the American people can never be ignored. The thing that is needed is to bring about a reawakening of embattled American liberalism so that the people themselves will insist upon and get a restoration of the kind of liberty that made America great.

If we, the people, don't resist, day by day, the insinuating power of the Government directive, the time may come in America when every lawyer will work for the bureaucracy and every newspaperman will get his copy from the ministry of propaganda, and every citizen will get his marching orders from Washington.

If that time should ever come, it will not be because, to borrow another phrase, anyone "planned it that way" but because we, the liberty-loving people, were too complacent—because we didn't start fighting in time.

PROPOSED RESTRICTION OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received a most illuminating letter from Mr. A. Warren Norton, manager of the Christian Science Monitor, regarding the proposed restriction of newsprint. This letter is such a valuable contribution to this subject that I ask that it be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

PUBLISHING SOCIETY,

Boston, Mass., March 5, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LODGE: I am glad to learn from your recent letter that you are endeavoring to keep in close touch with the newsprint situation as it seems to be developing in Washington, for there is no doubt but what it has far-reaching implications.

It would seem that the freedoms which were fought for and became the basis of this Republic are continually being encroached upon. There is no doubt but that if we wish to retain our freedom we must never give up freedom of the press and must in every turn overcome any encroachments upon it, regardless of the directions from which they come.

Freedom of the press without newsprint would obviously vanish. Any unnecessary restrictions upon its supply does, without a doubt, restrict the dissemination of the news to a public which should always be fully informed. Your job and mine is to see to it that no one at any time does anything to keep our great Nation from being informed.

I would like to say, and unselfishly, too, that sacrifices in the use of paper should be made in other lines first rather than with newsprint; where the use of paper is not strictly for war or military purposes.

We have all seen how through radio licensing restrictions may be placed, or could be placed, upon the radio stations of the country to the extent that they really do not enjoy the same freedom that the newspapers of the country now have.

I might direct your attention to the point that newspapers need advertising to offset a large part of the expenses involved in publication. This being the case, any restrictions in newsprint must reduce the size of newspapers thus limiting, and in a measure reducing the amount of money available, not only to print, but to gather news so that the public may be informed.

As I see it, there is a further danger that throughout the country there are many small newspapers, their size may already be small in number of pages, which would be harmed by a too drastic cut in the use of newsprint. In other words, with a large number of pages, a newspaper could easily cut 10, 20, or even 50 percent and wind up with, let us say, 18 or 20 pages which under normal conditions might be sufficient for news purposes. However, a publication starting out with the same number of pages, the reductions being up to 50 percent, would force many newspapers out of business.

Let us also not penalize those publishers who by virtue of their foresight protected themselves from such a war emergency as we now find ourselves in, and those newsprint manufacturers who also contemplated the same restrictions and foresaw the need of following a pattern which was not apprehended by others at that time.

There are perhaps many other things I could think of but possibly the above will be helpful. To be invincible we must be informed.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. WARREN NORTON,
Manager.

FARM SECURITY, NATIONAL SECURITY,
AND POST-WAR PLANNING—ADDRESS
BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Farm Security, National

Security, and Post-War Planning," delivered by the Vice President before a meeting of farmers and representatives of civic organizations, Columbus, Ohio, March 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET US DEFEND THE AMERICAN HOME— ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Let Us Defend the American Home," delivered by him on March 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR GUILT AND PUNISHMENT FOR WAR CRIMES — ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article having to do with war guilt and punishment for crimes against humanity, written by him, published in the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANTING THE VICTORY GARDEN— ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Planting the Victory Garden," delivered by Senator LUCAS at a banquet of the Catholic Charities of Rockford, Ill., on March 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TASKS OF CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator MURRAY relating to the tasks facing Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE AT CONVOCATION OF UNIVER- SITY OF TORONTO

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the convocation of the University of Toronto, Toronto Canada, February 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRADE AGREEMENTS IN A NEW WORLD— ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Trade Agreements in a New World," by Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, published in the Atlantic Monthly for March 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE W. NORRIS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on rural electrification delivered by Hon. George W. Norris, of Nebraska, at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association meeting at St. Louis, Mo., on January 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON DINNER ADDRESS BY AMBROSE O'CONNELL

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Ambrose O'Connell, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the George Washington dinner, March 6, 1943, at Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

BOUNDARIES OF SMALLER NATIONS— ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the boundaries of smaller nations written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of March 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRECY IN DIPLOMACY—ADDRESS BY HUGH M. GRANT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Pennington embodying an address delivered by Dr. Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania, in Chattanooga, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM HOWARD D. GREGG

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Howard D. Gregg, president of the State College for Colored Students at Dover, Del., advocating continuance of the National Youth Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOLUNTARY EMPLOYMENT—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD (CONN.) COURANT

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Keep Employment Voluntary," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of March 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF NATIONAL DAIRY SITUATION

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of the national dairy situation issued by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation under date of March 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOST DESPICABLE SABOTEUR—EDI- TORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE (IND.) NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Despicable Saboteur" published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of March 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF PIPE LINE FROM TEXAS TO INDIANA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 103) to investigate certain matters in connection with the proposed construction of an additional pipe line from Texas to Indiana, submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (and other Senators) on February 15, 1943.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOSPITALIZATION, DOMICILIARY CARE, AND BURIAL BENEFITS IN CERTAIN WORLD WAR NO. 2 CASES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1749) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 96) thereon. The bill is known as the act granting hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 73, Senate bill 230, a companion bill to the

bill which I have just reported from the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 230) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to certain World War No. 2 cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the Senator had asked unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator made a motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 230) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to certain World War No. 2 cases, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "following" and the colon, to strike out "Any officer, enlisted man, member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or Navy Nurse Corps (female) employed in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of the present war," and to insert: "World War No. 2—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service', as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "World War No. 2—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service', as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, House bill 1749 was passed by the House of Representatives unanimously, has been considered at length by the veterans' subcommittee of the Committee on Finance and unanimously reported by that subcommittee to the full committee, and unanimously reported by the full committee to the Senate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend to veterans who are now being discharged, who may have suffered disability, and who have become veterans of World War No. 2, the same opportunity for hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits as those which have hitherto been granted to veterans of World War No. 1.

Mr. President, it is an emergency matter for the reason that there are many men now being discharged from the armed forces after service in World War No. 2 as to whose status in veterans' hospitals, under the present law, there is some doubt. As a result thereof, men are being discharged—and this is particularly true of mental cases and tuberculosis cases—from the armed forces, and their families are being notified to come and get them; that they are not entitled under the present law to hospitalization in veterans' hospitals. Many men have been sent to State insane asylums, or efforts have been made to place them in State insane asylums, but the State authorities have been reluctant to take them, on the ground that this is purely a Federal obligation. I am ashamed to say, Mr. President, that in a considerable number of cases, particularly mental cases, the families of the men have been unable to take care of them, the State institutions have been unwilling to receive them, and so the men themselves, after being discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States, have actually been confined in common jails, through no other fault of their own than that they had suffered serious mental derangement, in many cases as the direct result of their service in the armed forces of the United States.

So, by the proposed legislation it is our purpose simply to do now at the outset of the emergency the same thing that was done 5½ years after the last war, and which has been the policy of the United States Government ever since as to veterans of World War No. 1. I say it would be a disgrace to the United States to permit this situation to continue.

Mr. President, in fairness I should say that the Veterans' Bureau proposed an amendment which would require the disabilities to have been noted in the service. Neither the Veterans' Subcommittee nor the full House committee, nor the Finance Committee of the Senate were willing to accept such an amendment for the reason that under the present law and regulations, which are simply extended to the veterans of World War No. 2, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has the power and the right and the duty, by regulation, to prescribe priorities in acceptances into hospitals and the extension of the facilities of the hospitals, so, under the proper regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Bureau, there is no danger of a man coming home with flat feet and crowding out mental cases or tubercular cases, or men who are bitterly and urgently in need of hospitalization.

Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment may be adopted. It provides simply for the status of the WAAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, and members of other organizations, entitling them to

hospitalization, but not to any pecuniary benefits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to Senate bill 230.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to substitute for the Senate bill, House bill 1749, which has just been favorably reported with an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1749) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, which had been reported from the Finance Committee, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "World War II—Any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service,' as used herein, shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the committee amendment to the House bill strikes out all after the enacting clause, and substitutes therefor the language of the Senate bill, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1749) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War II cases."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 230 will be indefinitely postponed.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to occupy a few minutes of the time of the Senate, and for the sake of continuity I ask the privilege of not being interrupted until I shall have finished my remarks at which time I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. President, America is engaged today in the greatest war effort in its entire history, an effort which will tax the human, and the material, as well as the spiritual resources of a hundred and thirty-five million people to a greater

extent than ever before. The restrictions and restraints, the sufferings and the sorrows of a global war are not only apparent but are becoming very real.

This war touches every shore, encompasses every sky, and takes in every body of water on the face of the earth. We are in to win, we must win, we will win, and America and its entire citizenry are willing to make every necessary sacrifice to that end.

But the question constantly arising in loyal American minds is how a free people can best utilize their form of government, their manpower, and their resources to win in a global war.

War is the most costly and devastating activity of man, and there must be a definite purpose for which men are willing to make supreme sacrifices. Our liberty, our right to be free was the result of a war. The purpose of that war was not entirely clear nor defined until there was a meeting of the minds resulting in the Declaration of Independence. With that defined determination, the armies of the colonies were united under one flag and victory was won. Out of victory came a government of written rules, of distributed authority, of divided powers made permanent by the writing and adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

Even the written Constitution was not satisfactory to the people who had made such great sacrifices for liberty. They demanded in addition what is commonly known as the Bill of Rights in which they enumerated the rights of the people. The first amendment provided as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Under this written form of government with guaranteed human rights, we have become outstanding among those nations of the earth where men of every nationality, creed, and color, have assembled and live in harmony. Now we must stand our greatest test, "trial by battle" on all the seas, in all the skies, and on the battle fronts of the entire world.

Early in this war, the President of the United States formulated two pronouncements as the laudable objectives for which our citizens are fighting and dying. First, the "four freedoms," and second, the Atlantic Charter.

There are some who fear that there are persons in this country, both in and outside our Government service, who would pull the flag of the Atlantic Charter so high that it would supersede our Constitution, and there are those who would elevate the banner of the "four freedoms" to such an extent that we would lose sight of our own Bill of Rights.

When we engage in war we engage to win. War follows the rule of necessity; we do the things that are necessary to win. The strategy of the war, the type and size of our Army, our Navy, and Air Corps, the type of weapons and their

number, are determined by the necessities of the hour and the turn of events, but we must be sure that in all this unprecedented war effort we follow the rules laid down in the Constitution and continue to guard the human protection provided for in our Bill of Rights.

It is significant that the founding fathers included in the rights to be demanded for the people the following language:

Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of the press.

It can be truthfully said that the precious rights of individual men and the fundamental institution of our representative form of government have been fostered and defended by the free press of America more than by any other element of our national life, and that so long as we remain freemen and are individually willing to fight, to suffer, and to die to preserve a free form of government, we must recognize no emergency as being so great as to necessitate the destruction or unnecessary abridgement of the free press of America.

Recent orders and counterorders issued in connection with the amounts of paper to be used by newspapers arrest attention and cause concern regarding what seem to be related events going back over a number of years. Their character provokes inquiry and comment.

Approximately 10 years ago an attempt was made under the guise of national emergency to regulate all the industries of America. So-called codes of fair competition were drawn up for the various industries. But the bright minds who developed the codes of fair competition forgot to take into consideration that the press is one industry and the only industry that was guaranteed its freedom from abridgement by the Constitution of the United States. The Bill of Rights was never intended to guarantee the freedom of the press only for the benefit of the publisher. The importance of the guaranty was the people's right to have the publisher free for their protection and their benefit.

Notwithstanding the provision of protection of the press in the Bill of Rights, a code of fair competition was drawn up for the newspaper industry of America. Each publisher assenting to this code without reservation would have thereby waived his constitutional rights and would have submitted himself to the future regulations and arbitrary rulings of an administrator.

The newspapers of the country, which have always guarded the rights provided for the people, waged a successful fight to have inserted a saving clause in the code affecting newspapers, which read as follows:

Those submitting this code recognize that pursuant to section 10-B of the act, the President may from time to time cancel or modify any order approving this code but in submitting or subscribing to this code, the publishers do not thereby consent to any modification thereof, except as each may thereto subsequently agree, nor do they thereby waive any constitutional rights or

consent to the imposition of any requirements that might restrict or interfere with the constitutional guaranty of the freedom of the press.

The President declared that no one consenting to this code waived any constitutional rights, adding:

The recitation of the freedom of the press clause in the code has no more place than would the recitation of the whole Constitution or the Ten Commandments.

The publishers, however, insisted that if this added section made no modification, there should be no objection to its inclusion, and it was included.

It is well that it was included, for shortly thereafter the Attorney General, the appointed legal officer of the administration, included the following paragraph in his brief in the case of the United States against the Weirton Steel Co., as follows:

The defendant having applied for approval under the Recovery Act of a code of fair competition and having obtained the benefits accruing to it under the act, by reason of such approval, cannot attack the constitutionality of the provision of that code.

It is a well-settled rule in the Federal courts that—

One who has himself voluntarily invoked a statute, who has received the benefits flowing from a statute, is estopped to assert its unconstitutionality.

In other words, the Attorney General did contend that those who had accepted the code without reservation had waived their constitutional objections.

The predominant fear in the minds of the publishers of this country at that time was the fear of licensing by the Government of the press of America. It might be well to point out that at the time of the drafting of the Constitution and the adoption of the Bill of Rights, there were three agencies in this country which were predominant in the building of public opinion. They were the press, the public platform, and the pulpits of America. It is significant that the people insisted that all three be guaranteed freedom in the written Bill of Rights.

It might be well further to point out that at that time there were no motion pictures, and there was no radio. Both are now subject to licensing or regulation by the Government today.

It was the predominant fear of the publishers, confronted with this bureaucratically developed code, that there might be an insistence later on licensing the press of America.

We find some evidence later that would bear that out. Last spring when the Office of Defense Transportation issued its early orders restricting the use of rubber-tired vehicles for the very laudable purpose of saving rubber, no mention was made in those original orders of newspapers specifically. No recognition was given to their importance as an essential industry.

The drastic restrictions originally contemplated would have reduced the press of America to one edition a day, which would have resulted in putting many newspapers out of business.

After long periods of negotiation, modifications were adopted, resulting in a 40 percent reduction in the mileage of newspaper trucks.

Not only were the constitutional guaranties of the press overlooked, but their importance to the national welfare was likewise overlooked and ignored. It might be pointed out here that in our modern civilization, the right to distribute the news is a part of the right to print it.

The freedom of the press can be abridged in many ways, namely, by denying access to the news, denying the facilities to print, or denying the facilities to distribute the printed work to the people by unnecessary and arbitrary regulations, restrictions, or restraints.

This attitude of disregard for the rights of the press was repeated in November in the issuance of Office of Defense Transportation Order No. 21. Under this order, a certificate of war necessity was required for every commercial motor vehicle. Under its provisions, the Administrator had the power to designate the manner, the purpose, and the points between which each and every vehicle should be operated. He also had the power to force the lease or rental of one owner's truck to another person or corporation.

Under this order the foregoing powers were to be given to the Administrator— notwithstanding any contract, lease, or other commitment expressed or implied.

Again, in applying for certificates of war necessity under this order, the press of America was required to waive constitutional and legal rights under a provision whereby it agreed to surrender these certificates upon demand. With eternal vigilance, it insisted upon a paragraph as follows:

In filing the attached application for a certificate of war necessity the undersigned does not waive any constitutional rights or consent to the imposition of any requirements that might restrict or interfere with the constitutional guaranteed right of a newspaper publisher to distribute his publication.

Since that time there have been further curtailments and restrictions through the rationing of rubber, gasoline, metals, machinery, and other materials essential to the newspaper industry.

In the drafting of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, it was only after continued vigilance on the part of the press of America that exemptions from price fixing of advertising and circulation rates were obtained.

The interference on the part of the Government by the use of F. B. I. agents in visiting members of the Associated Press in an attempt to intimidate them and cause them to change their rules, and the subsequent suit brought by the Attorney General against the Associated Press, are continued evidence of harassment of the press by some men in the present administration.

Censorship of the press in time of war is most difficult, and at the same time most dangerous. In theory, it should be

used only to prevent valuable information from reaching the enemy. In practice, however, it can be used to keep bad news from reaching the American people, as was the case in the suppression of the facts regarding Pearl Harbor for a whole year after they were fully known to our enemies. Its use never should be tolerated to protect incompetence or to conceal mistakes and failures on the part of public servants. The press cannot discharge its duty to the public if censorship is wrongfully administered.

The action on the part of the Federal Communications Commission since 1941 in preventing a newspaper from securing a license to operate a radio station—not because the public would not be well served, but only because the applicant was a publisher of a newspaper—is indicative of a continued bias and hostility against the press of America.

From time to time, the W. P. B. has issued orders curtailing the use of many materials important to the production of newspapers, such as metals, machinery, inks, and so forth. The one material which forms the very life-blood of a newspaper is newsprint, or the paper upon which the news is printed and distributed to the people.

For more than 18 months, various bureaus and departments of the Government have threatened to issue orders restricting the use of newsprint to an extent varying from 10 to 70 percent. These threats have all been under the guise of war necessity, using the vaguest generalities in justification. Up to date, no genuine justification for these threatened curtailments has been made public.

The first order limiting the consumption of newsprint was issued by the W. P. B. effective January 1, 1943. It provided for an over-all reduction of approximately 10 percent. This the press accepted, although it questioned the necessity for such a reduction. Since then there have been various reports and conflicting suggestions of further curtailment. However, it was officially announced on February 9 that an order was soon to be issued, effective April 1, for a further curtailment of newsprint amounting to another 10 percent, and it was intimated that further curtailments might follow.

Through the continued vigilance of the press, aided by Members of the House of Representatives, a demand was made for the facts upon which this order was to be issued and proof of the necessity for any further cut.

The facts to prove that a further cut was necessary were not submitted, and on February 20, 10 days following the announcement by the Government that a further cut was absolutely necessary, it was officially announced that any further cut would be postponed indefinitely.

It is, of course, possible that this proposed curtailment was the unplanned result of the confusion which comes with the war effort. But it is fitting to inquire whether orders for a curtailment of use of paper by newspapers is a continuation of the harassment which has marked the present administration's atti-

titude toward newspapers, or is because of the necessities imposed by a national war economy.

What are the facts which demand the impairment of one of the most important contributors to our successful drive for victory over our enemies? Do our war needs truly require this reduction? Or is there some other plan behind this move—some animus or group which schemes by this device to strangle American newspapers?

The rescinding of the order only 10 days after it was announced is evidence of further hostility to the press and the desire by some people holding responsible positions in the Government to unnecessarily interfere with the proper and all-important functioning of the press of America.

While these threats were being made to seriously limit consumption of newsprint, the disclosure was made on the Senate floor by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] of the fabulous and extravagant use of paper to print the now famous magazine called "Victory," for the self-glorification of the present administration.

It was further disclosed by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] that the Government is using nearly 10 times as much paper today as it did in 1941.

I believe that a full disclosure of this increased use of paper by the Government would show a determined desire on the part of some men in our present Government to supplant the free press of our country by Government dominated "news," through the use of handouts from the various Government bureaus.

I believe that a full investigation of the publications issued by Government bureaus would show that enough paper is wasted to print all of the newspapers in a sizable percentage of the States of this entire Nation.

As we move on in this gigantic effort of global war, there will be constant demands for regulations and restrictions of every manner and kind, and the people will be looking constantly to their Representatives in Congress to protect them and the press through which they may be constantly advised and informed of every phase of our war effort.

In campaigns for enlistments, in scrap and salvage drives, in the sale of Government bonds and securities, in aiding the people concerning the details of rationing and restrictive orders, the press of America has contributed its full share to the magnificent war effort of our country.

This unprecedented service, presenting complete daily, visual coverage of national objectives, could not have been accomplished by any other medium or agency.

Today and in the future, the housewives of America will be determining the daily diet under the point system of rationing the food of our entire population through the aid of a page out of some newspaper hanging on the kitchen wall or on the cupboard door.

A newspaper is not a warship, a plane, a tank, or a battalion of infantry, but it serves in its field just as fittingly and importantly.

Modern war has spread from the land and the sea to a third dimension—the sky. It may also be said to have extended to a fourth dimension—the human mind. In the last-mentioned field of warfare there can be no more successful weapon than the newspaper. It carries the war to our enemies—not by explosive bomb or torpedo, but by the greater impact of concrete expressions of the ideals of truth and liberty.

In these times of national peril, the American people look rightfully to their Government for light and leadership. Reciprocally, a representative government in its own self-interest is impelled to seek contact with its citizens. Neither can exist in peace or in war without the other, and there is no channel of communication which is so mobile, so potent, and so mutually helpful as the newspapers of our country.

The newspaper has already had its valuable contributions to this Nation reduced by the shortages of rubber and the rationing of gasoline. We cannot stand by now and watch new handicaps unjustly imposed. We cannot tolerate those stupid minds which fancy they can do without the newspaper—or who want to bend it to their selfish purposes.

The destruction of the newspaper in Germany was one of the steps taken to put Hitler's gangsters into power. Without a strong, free press in the United States, the American people will be without one of their most vigorous protagonists, one which more than any other force, save perhaps this Congress, has remained true to the idea of American liberty.

Weaken the press, and the people will be without a means through which they can give fullest support to their Government in the grim fight ahead. On its side, the Government will be without one of its most potent means to achieve an early victory.

Congress shares today equal responsibility with the other branches of the Government in the successful prosecution of the war and in setting up means by which the civilian public may preserve the rights and liberties guaranteed them under the Constitution. We cannot abdicate. We cannot shrug off our responsibilities. The fate of this Republic is as much in our hands as it is in the hands of those bureaucrats who have been placed in official positions under the war powers granted by this body, but who are not directly answerable to the electorate of this Nation as we are. We cannot stand by trustingly in the assumption that the purposes for which we enacted legislation are the sole preoccupation of those who are active in carrying out administration of the laws. Experience has shown that we can place little confidence in the claims of certain individuals that the war wholly engrosses their attention and that the vast powers granted them are used solely to achieve victory over the Axis Powers.

The vital importance and essentiality of our American press increases as the shadows of this global war begin to lengthen. The importance and essentiality of our American press will grow as the rays of peace begin to dawn. It

will be doubly important that all our people be well informed by a free and alert press concerning the various proposals of suggested programs for the future peace of the world.

Congress has no greater responsibility than to assure the people that the press of this country will be protected and preserved in full vigor, and to notify the heads of the bureaus that we, the representatives of the people, will not tolerate any further unnecessary or arbitrary restrictive or restraining order that will cause the press of America to become either ineffective or impotent.

The newspapers of America stand in the shadow of no other group's patriotism. They have been marked for their loyalty and for their energy and devotion to the cause you and I serve. But there is a persistent effort to brand them as pariahs, to smear and assail them, to separate them from their Government and from the people they serve.

The movement should be seen for what it is. If there is malice, let us ascertain the reasons for it. If it comes as the clumsy result of inexperienced administrators, let that fact be known—what coterie, what clique, or what group of men constantly seek to impose these restrictions on America's first and last line of freedom.

The newspapers of America, I say, are ready to share in any deprivation required by the war; but prudence demands that we inquire whether through the instrumentality of war regulations the newspapers are being made the target of an attack by enemies of America—saboteurs who seek to destroy the newspapers and, through destroying them, to destroy one of the most treasured rights of American citizens.

When the Government established the recent base for the use of newsprint, they chose the amount used by the various newspapers in 1941 when the interests of the American people were concerned with wars between foreign nations. That base ignored the present interest and increased demands for news on the part of the American people when our own flesh and blood and our own country now are engaged in the death struggle of this global war.

We need but to turn our eyes toward the countries of our enemies to see what follows the destruction of a free press. We have only to remember the oppression of the peoples of other lands to know what comes as the result of Government control of newspapers by emergency regulations. Yes; we have only to read the history of our country to recall from what conditions our forefathers fled and why they surrounded the press with these constitutional guaranties.

Any step falsely taken which impairs the freedom and usefulness of newspapers is a perfidious act. Those who join any such conspiracy are enemies of this Republic and active supporters of those alien philosophies against which the whole military and civilian power of this country is now being mustered and marshaled.

Attempts to hamstring newspapers strike at the very principles on which this country was founded. Our forefathers foresaw the double importance of a free press as an inalienable right of the people and as a dynamic force in promulgating the ideals and idea of liberty. If they did not, why would they have given it such singular mention in that great document under which this country has risen to a state which is the inspiration of—yes, the hope of the world today?

Let me review and summarize: First, the attempt to limit the press under N. R. A.; then the hostile attitude of the Federal Communications Commission; the tactics used by the F. B. I., and the subsequent suit against the Associated Press by the Department of Justice; the restrictions placed in the original draft of the Price Control Act and in the Office of Defense Transportation orders; the arbitrary censorship of the news and orders from the Office of War Information; the rationing of rubber, gasoline, metals, and other materials; then the 10-percent cut of newsprint, and the subsequent trend to cut the use of newsprint by 10 percent in addition, which threatened order was withdrawn when a demand for a justification was made; the failure of the War Manpower Commission to declare the press of the Nation as one of our essential industries. Here is the evidence of the progression of a restrictive hand reaching out to limit and curtail the one instrument of information that was guaranteed its freedom in the Constitution under which we live. Each restrictive step shrewdly progressed under the cover of some ascribed emergency, but always short of a showdown, and always with a passing, soothing assurance of "only this, and nothing more."

The newspaper is the voice of freedom. The great minds which built a refuge and bastion for freemen in the United States perceived the necessity of keeping the press free, and they took steps to implement that freedom. Are we to permit the use of sly, indirect methods through which the press is now to be brought finally under control?

The fact that we are in a global war magnifies rather than minimizes the importance of the press of this country.

As we move deeper and deeper into this global war, our people are looking with increasing anxiety and interest for the unadulterated news of each day to be brought to them by a press free from unnecessary and vicious bureaucratic, efficiency-destroying restrictions. Yes, Mr. President; the people of America are looking to the Congress, their elected officials and representatives, to protect their precious, priceless right to be served as freemen by the free press of America.

LEND-LEASE MATERIALS FURNISHED TO RUSSIA

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Revercomb
Billbo	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Scruggs
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lodge	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Maybank	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
George	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALGREEN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] requested that announcement be made that he is necessarily absent today attending the last surviving forum of pure democracy in the United States, the annual New England town meeting in his home town of Temple, N. H.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the country was no doubt astounded to read in this morning's newspapers reports as to what Admiral Standley, our Ambassador at Moscow, is reported to have said with respect to the failure of the Russian people to receive information regarding the aid which the United States has been giving to Russia during the course of the present war.

Mr. President, there is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations a bill to extend the operations of the lend-lease law for 1 year. It is expected that tomorrow the Committee on Foreign Relations will give consideration to the extension of that act. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of

Representatives has already unanimously, I understand, reported favorably a similar bill to the House, and it is now under discussion in that body.

Mr. President, I regard the statement of Admiral Standley as a most unfortunate one. As a matter of fact, information of aid extended by the United States to the Russian armies has been given to the Russian people. I am advised that Pravda, which is the official newspaper of the Communist Party and the Government of Russia, on the 27th day of January printed in its columns a report made by Mr. Stettinius, the Lend-Lease Administrator, as to the aid which had been extended up until that date. I am furthermore advised that the Russian press, from time to time, carries the addresses and speeches of Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt with respect to what we have been doing and what we purpose to do with regard to Russia.

I desire to submit a brief statement of what we have been doing in that regard within the scope of the war.

For the morning newspapers of March 8 Mr. Stettinius released a press statement which I ask that the clerk read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, made public today the following facts and figures on lend-lease aid to Russia:

In addition to the many thousand planes, tanks, and guns shipped to the Soviet Union the United States has provided: (1) Considerable quantities of raw materials for Russia's munitions industry; (2) important transportation and communications equipment for use along and behind the long Russian front.

Up to February 1, 1943, we had shipped to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics more than 580,000 tons of steel, 46,000 tons of aluminum and duraluminum, 21,500 tons of zinc, 94,000 tons of copper and brass, and other industrial materials such as nickel and molybdenum for Soviet factories making planes, tanks, and other war equipment. We have shipped 50,000 tons of toluol and TNT and 75,000 tons of other chemicals for Soviet production of bombs, high explosive shells, and other munitions.

For Soviet railroads we have sent 75,000 tons of rails and 17,000 tons of other railroad equipment. We have sent 140,000 field telephones in addition to hundreds of thousands of miles of field telephone wire. We have shipped 268,000 tons of petroleum products for the operation of Soviet planes and trucks.

Of the 99,000 military motor vehicles other than tanks shipped to Soviet Union from the United States tens of thousands of trucks are employed in maintaining supply lines behind the Russian front. We have shipped 72,500 trucks, 17,500 jeeps and armored cars, 7,700 motorcycles and 1,300 military tractors.

We have shipped nearly 3,000,000 pairs of army boots for Soviet soldiers who battle in snow and ice and mud in addition to 18,000 tons of sole leather for Red Army shoes made in Soviet factories.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, my authority for referring to the action of Pravda, the newspaper of Moscow, is that the New York Times on January 24, 1943, reported that Pravda, one of the leading newspapers of the Soviet Union, contained a news item about the planes, tanks, motor vehicles, and like articles,

supplied to the Soviets by the British and ourselves.

I wish to call attention to the fact that those who use such articles—soldiers and others—are bound to know that they are from the United States, because they have characteristics and individualities which distinguish them from articles manufactured in other countries. The people of Russia, seeing and using a great multitude of United States and British lend-lease supplies, must of necessity know of the lend-lease aid which has been supplied to Russia.

I think it is of interest to note that a recent story by Mr. Henry Cassidy, who is head of the Associated Press Bureau in Moscow, clearly indicates that the people of Soviet Russia not only know of but appreciate the supplies which have been sent to them under lend-lease. The full report of Mr. Cassidy's article, which appeared in the New York Times of March 6, indicates that the people of Russia know a good deal about the lend-lease aid which is reaching them. Mr. Cassidy also had an article in the February 28 issue of the Washington Star, which points out substantially the same facts about the knowledge of the Russian people as to lend-lease aid.

The Russian newspapers generally report in full the speeches of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, many of which relate to lend-lease aid.

I should like to have Senators observe that up to March 1, 1943, the United States had sent 3,250,000 tons of lend-lease supplies to Russia, covering such a great variety of items of distinctly American type that the Russian soldiers and people, as I observed a moment ago, are bound to know whence these articles come.

We have sent to Russia more than 2,600 airplanes, more than 3,000 tanks, more than 130,000 submachine guns, about 90,000 jeeps, armored cars, and other military vehicles, hundreds of thousands of field telephones, thousands of miles of field telephone wire, and 580,000 tons of steel and steel products.

We have also sent them American motorcycles, gas-driven generators, chemicals and chemical products, army boots and sole leather, and other industrial products. In addition to these munitions, large quantities of American food have been sent to Russia, and as to much of this there are various indications to the Soviet Army and the Russian people that the food has come from this country.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading a brief report prepared by Mr. Stettinius, issued on January 20, 1943, with respect to expenditures in behalf of Russia. The statement gives an outline of supplies furnished up to the time of the report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States made important progress in 1942 in sending arms and other supplies to the Soviet Union under lend-lease. We have not yet been able to send as much as we should like—or as much as the Soviet Army needs—and part of what we have sent

has been lost on the way. But, after a slow start, lend-lease shipments have greatly increased. They are continuing to increase in spite of the shortage of shipping and enemy attacks along the difficult supply routes to Russia.

Lend-lease shipments of war supplies to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in November 1942 reached a new high. In November 1942 the exports to Russia were 13 times the total sent in January 1942. Two-thirds of the value of November shipments were accounted for by military items. The balance were industrial materials for Soviet munitions factories and food for the Soviet Army.

Up to January 1, 1943, the United States has shipped to the Soviet Union under lend-lease more than 3,200 tanks. This is more than have been sent under lend-lease to any other country since the beginning of the lend-lease program in March 1941, although lend-lease aid to Russia did not begin until October 1941—8 months later.

We have sent to the Soviet Union under lend-lease almost 2,600 planes. This is more than we have shipped to the United Kingdom or any other military theater. We have sent 81,000 trucks and jeeps and other military motor vehicles to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The United Kingdom has also supplied the Soviet Union with quantities of military equipment produced in Great Britain. The United Kingdom has shipped to Russia more than 2,600 tanks and more than 2,000 planes. These arms are being supplied to Russia by the United Kingdom on a lend-lease basis.

Lend-lease shipments of food to the Soviet Union from the United States are rapidly growing in importance. We have now begun sending food to the Soviet Union in greater quantities than to the United Kingdom. As the Soviet armies take the offensive a sufficient supply of food is as vital to their success as planes and tanks.

The people of the Soviet Union have so far waged their magnificent battle against the Nazis principally with their own arms. But lend-lease aid to Russia has started to grow to sizable proportions. It will grow still more in 1943.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD another report by Mr. Stettinius for release February 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the beginning of the Soviet aid program the United States has shipped more than 2,900,000 tons of war supplies to the Soviet Union.

Lend-lease shipments of war supplies to the Soviet Union in January were almost 10 percent greater than in the previous month.

The great majority of the supplies that we have shipped to Russia are reaching their destinations. In December 1942 and January 1943 there were no losses, although further losses in later months are to be expected.

Two-thirds of all shipments to the Soviet Union from the United States have been made in American ships.

The Soviet Army continues to sustain its great offensives principally with Russian-produced weapons. Lend-lease supplies have played a small but important part. American tanks, planes, and trucks are continuing to go forward. In addition we have sent to the Soviet Union many other vital military supplies. For example, we have sent hundreds of thousands of miles of field telephone wire which have been of major importance in the maintenance of Soviet Army communications on the 3,000-mile Russian front. We have shipped a considerable

amount of steel, which Soviet factories have made into Russian tanks, and chemicals, which they have used in the manufacture of Russian bombs and high-explosive shells that are now ripping apart the Nazi lines.

January shipments of food to Russia were one-fifth larger than in December. This food is urgently needed by the Soviet Army. We sent many thousands of tons of wheat and flour, sugar, canned pork, dried beans and other vegetables, lard, and vegetable fats. We have so far been able to send only very small amounts of butter, which the Russians have requested especially for their wounded soldiers in military hospitals. In January butter shipments amounted to 682 tons. This was the equivalent of less than one-sixth of an ounce from each man, woman, and child in the United States.

We shall continue to make every effort to increase the flow of lend-lease supplies for Russia to greater proportions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has had interim reports from the Lend-Lease Administrator and his assistants and has a full and complete report, partly in public hearings and partly in executive hearings, the reports of which are not yet printed, as to the volume of aid which we have been sending to Russia.

It is most unfortunate that any incident might be provoked at this time which would in anywise cause any friction or unpleasant reaction as between Russia and the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very happy that the Senator has presented the record this morning in the fashion in which he has presented it. The able Vice President of the United States sounded a timely warning yesterday about the necessity for our future friendly relationship with Russia. He said, among other things, that in connection with future contacts it is very necessary that we do not "double-cross" Russia. At least on the fact of the record up to date I am sure we can all agree—can we not—that we have not double-crossed Russia as yet?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is absolutely accurate in his implication, and I thank him for the interruption.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the report of Mr. Stettinius up to December 31, 1942, which reveals that we have extended aid, in terms of dollars, in the amount of \$1,532,230,000 for arms, munitions, and supplies for Russian account.

I wish to observe that great volumes of these supplies intended for Russia had to be carried by convoy through the Arctic Sea to the northern ports of Russia. In the past we have suffered very severe losses in those convoys. Some of the munitions intended for Russia never reached her because of the dangers and hazards of sea transportation; but in recent months our losses have greatly declined, and for the past 2 or 3 months they have been insignificant. With the opening of spring, however, the Lend-Lease Administrator is quite frank in saying that the percentage of losses may increase over the low point which

we have been experiencing in the immediate past.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the American people and to the Russian people that, regardless of what Admiral Standley may have said, regardless of what his reactions may be, the people of the United States and the Congress will not be deterred in going ahead with the reenactment of lend-lease, and in continuing to supply to Russia every available ounce of material and food necessary to the winning of the war. We recognize the magnificent contribution which Russia has made to the war effort. We gladly, and without any reluctance, have been sending these supplies, and we shall not be deterred by any incident of the nature quoted in the press this morning.

We are doing this not simply as an act of generosity to Russia, but because we are acting as her ally, and every supply and munition which we can give to the Russians lessens the burden which otherwise we should have to bear in making war.

It is highly important that we maintain this cordial relationship with Russia, not alone during the dark days of the war, but when peace at last shall come. Russia is bound to know that she will need the moral support and cooperation of the United States and the other United Nations when the war shall come to an end no less than she needs them now. She will never be able to forget that at a time when she thought she was enjoying cordial relationships, relationships of friendship, practically the relationship of an ally with Germany, the Germans treacherously assailed her, invaded her soil, and destroyed the lives of her citizens. When peace shall come she cannot ever lie down to slumber at night, with Germany at her flank, without the consciousness of the assurance of aid from the other Allied Nations in some form of collective security, so as to make sure that the world shall not again be drenched in blood by such a war and such a tragedy as we are now witnessing in the world.

I would remind Admiral Standley, and all others who are interested, that while there is no western front already established by military force, the establishment of a front in north Africa has been of tremendous aid and succor and assistance to the Russian armies. With the establishment of an American and British force in north Africa, which is a potential and perhaps an ultimate threat toward the western front, Germany has been compelled to recall from the Russian front many of her divisions in order to anticipate and to be ready to meet any attack on the west, and that has contributed substantially to Russian military operations.

Mr. President, I glory in the exploits of the Russian armies. Nothing finer in all the history of modern warfare has ever been written than the heroic and gallant defense of Stalingrad, and the courageous rallying of Russian forces, whose fortunes therefore had not been of the best, to drive from Russian soil the invaders and violators of their homes.

I wish to see Russia and the United States continue to cooperate. I wish to see them cooperate after this war shall have come to an end.

Mr. President, it seems to me that any man who is undertaking to look into the future with a view to the world's welfare and to the peace of the earth must reach the inevitable conclusion that when the war shall have come to an end the United Nations and the people who want to preserve the peace, who want to harness ambitions of conquest and of world dominion, must form some character of association or instrumentality for concerted action for the preservation of the peace and for the curbing of wild ambitions which threaten the life and the security of peaceful people and the destruction of free government everywhere on the earth. In that association, in that instrumentality, which I feel will be set up, Russia must be at the council table along with the other nations who have borne the burden and the brunt of the present war.

Mr. President, while we do not agree with her political philosophy, Russia has made a notable struggle for 25 years in working out her own domestic policies at home. After centuries of wandering in the darkness and the wilderness she has been struggling to work out some form of government suited to her own needs and agreeable to her conceptions of political philosophy.

We are not concerned directly with what Russia may do with respect to her own domestic affairs, but in an international sense we cannot ignore a great people with a population of 160,000,000, holding dominion over the wide sweeps of Europe and Asia. We cannot ignore her, and I for one shall welcome the cooperation of Russia in after-the-war conferences and agreements as we have welcomed her cooperation in the struggle we are now making for the survival of free government and democratic institutions.

Mr. President, I regret the necessity to criticize the ineptness of our Ambassador to Russia. I cannot understand why he should make such a statement as he did without having had accurate information about the matter. But the information which has come to me—not in a great volume—convinces me that the Russian people and the Russian Government do know of the aid which the United States is undertaking to send to Russia. Perhaps in its volume it is disappointing. I can understand how the Russians want some troops to stand by their side, troops from the other United Nations. I can understand how Russia would like to have swarms of American and British and other airplanes hovering along the flanks of her armies as they advance across the snows of Russia. I can understand how Russia would like to feel that the navies of the other United Nations are ringed about her in support of her war effort. But, Mr. President, the United States is doing all that it possibly can to get supplies to Russia. We do not command the seas, because there, lying in wait, is the deadly submarine. We do not command the coasts of Norway and the far Arctic from which land-based planes have

soared out and assaulted our convoys and sunk our ships. We are not only sending supplies through the northern ports, but we have been sending them up through the Middle East, through Iraq, from Basra on the Persian Gulf, and we shall continue to send them to the limits of our ability to secure and to transport them.

We all know that transport is the so-called bottleneck of the whole situation. It not only hampers us in aiding Russia but hampers us in our own military and naval operation in the South Pacific, and in the Atlantic, and in the European theater, and in north Africa. God knows that if we had the shipping, secure from successful enemy attack, it would be loaded with men and arms and munitions, and it would carry them to the battle fronts where our men, whenever given the opportunity, have performed so handsomely and so gallantly.

I trust that no unfavorable reactions may result from the incident provoked by the remarks of Admiral Standley in Moscow. I know that they came as a shock and a surprise to those who are in authority here in the United States.

Mr. President, I want this parting message to go to the Russian people: The Russians may not have given to our aid the publicity which we might feel was due it. That, however, is a matter for the internal administration of the Russian people and their government. As we know, they have been more or less secretive from the beginning with respect to their military operations. It is not unlikely that Mr. Stalin does desire the Russian people to know that large amounts of supplies and munitions have been produced by the Russians themselves, and, after all, Russian production has accounted for the large percentage, of course, of the munitions and supplies used by the Russian armies. But, regardless of all those considerations, I want to give the assurance that we shall not hesitate to go on with the renewal of the Lend-Lease Act; we shall not hesitate in supplying food and arms and munitions and supplies to the Russian armies in the future, as we have undertaken to do in the past. We pray God that as we look into the future of the months ahead we may be able to increase the volume of arms, and to increase the volume of munitions, and to increase the volume of food and succor to the gallant and brave armies of Russia, which are driving the enemy before them on the eastern front, as we shall, I hope, when ready, be able to drive him on the western front.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 729.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) Until January 1, 1944, every registrant who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor on a farm, or whose principal occupation consists of employment on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States; and until January 1, 1944, no such registrant shall leave such occupation or endeavor or cease to be employed in connection with such production or harvesting unless, prior thereto, he requests his selective service local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to engage in some other occupation or endeavor, to be employed in some other work, or to become a member of such land or naval forces: *Provided*, That each man who is deferred pursuant to this subsection shall receive from his selective service local board at the time of such deferment a certificate stating that such deferment has been found by such board to be in the best interests of the war effort."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that during the consideration of this bill there should be a quorum of the Senate present. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Kentucky withhold the request for a minute?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment. I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill is not yet before the Senate, is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it is. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The bill is before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Colorado has been agreed to, and the bill is now the pending business before the Senate.

The committee amendment, which is a substitute for the original bill, has been read. The Senator from Colorado now offers a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Senate bill 729 is before the Senate now by virtue of a majority report of the Committee on Military Affairs, which was accompanied by a minority report in which notice was given that a substitute would be offered on the part of the minority. The Senator from Colorado now acting, not as the spokesman of the minority, but in an individual capacity, as I understand, offers another substitute than that proposed to be presented by the minority.

Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry is whether the offering of the amendment now by the Senator from

Colorado in his individual capacity deprives the minority of its opportunity to offer the substitute which was discussed in the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that it does not. The Senator from Colorado offers his amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment. That is an amendment only in the first degree. It will then be in order for the Senator from Wyoming, or any other Senator, to offer a further amendment, or a further substitute. That is because of the fact that the amendment proposes to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is the consideration of Senate bill 729, commonly known as the Bankhead farm deferment bill. The bill has been reported by the committee with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert new language. The Senator from Colorado has offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. McNARY. That is perfectly in order, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is also in order for the Senator from Wyoming, or any other Senator, to offer a further substitute.

Mr. McNARY. I think it is very important legislation. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had already done so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky had risen for that purpose. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bone	Hayden	Scruggs
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lodge	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Danaher	Maybank	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WILEY. I yield only that the Senator from Wyoming may offer an amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], it is proposed to insert the following:

That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended be amended by adding the following proviso: "Provided further, That for the purposes of this subsection, a registrant shall be found by his selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in local board release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in such release No. 164: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System for the purposes of this subsection such additional agricultural commodities as in his judgment are essential to the war effort, together with the minimum standard of production per person which he determines to be applicable to such additional agricultural commodities."

PROPOSED FOREIGN RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL—FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND RADIO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we have been privileged to hear two stimulating addresses, one of them being on the subject of freedom of the press. I did not know that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] was to speak on that subject, or I should not have prepared my address.

We heard another address, relating to the question of foreign policy. In my opinion, all the "fuss and feathers" about Ambassador Standley is only a tempest in a teapot. Joseph Stalin is the greatest realist in the world. I am sure he appreciates what America has done for Russia. He knows that a second front was opened in north Africa. He knows that Germany has been compelled to take from the front in Europe division after division of her best troops and put them in Africa. Moreover, Mr. President, Stalin knows that we have split the German air force, and that the terrific bombardment which Germany is now receiving has divided her air force so that it cannot repel the attacks of the Russians on the eastern front.

As I have already said, Stalin is a realist, and there is no need of trying to befuddle our own people. I think what we had better do is to recognize that now, as well as in the post-war period, there will be no "selling short" by anybody. We know that we are all in the same boat, and that if we do not row and work

together the boat will go down. It seems to me that that is the proper analysis of the situation.

I wish now to speak concerning freedom of the press.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the other subject, will he yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like again to comment along the line of my interrogatories to the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] when he was speaking.

While the statement of Ambassador Standley was amazing, I believe it was equally amazing for the distinguished Vice President of the United States yesterday to suggest that America is even capable of double-crossing Russia, or double-crossing anyone. I desire to make it perfectly clear that in my opinion American policy in connection with the war will never result in double-crossing anyone; and certainly the record up to date clearly indicates that on our part, at least, there has been no double-crossing of anyone.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. I agree with his conclusions. Of course, there can be no thought of America ever engaging in any double-crossing. We and our allies are engaged in a fight for our very lives. If anyone realizes that fact, it is Joe Stalin. He is a realist, and he knows the meaning of war. His country has given over 6,000,000 lives to this contest, and it is doing a tremendous job. As was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the people of Russia know that our matériel has been an important element in determining the reverses so far as the Germans are concerned. For us to use the statement made by Ambassador Standley, which was undoubtedly made under circumstances about which we know nothing, to give our own people the impression that we are about to weaken the association between us and the other United Nations, to me is mere folderol, and does not sound sensible or reasonable. Certainly it is not realistic.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for a comment.

Mr. WHEELER. I simply want to say that I agree with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said about the astounding statement which was made by the Vice President, when he intimated that we might double-cross Russia. The American people will not double-cross Russia or any other country. Russia can be sure of that. I was equally astounded by the statement made by the distinguished Vice President when he said that today no one in this country will admit that he is an isolationist. I do not know what the Vice President meant by that, but if he meant that no one in this country will admit

that, before we got into the war, he stood for trying to keep this country out of it, then he is sadly mistaken in that viewpoint, because I did everything I could do to try to keep this country out of war. I thought we should keep out of it before we entered the war and I think we could have kept out had we followed the right foreign policies. I am proud of the part I took in trying to keep our country out of war, and I have no apologies to make to anyone in this country for the position I took.

With reference to Admiral Standley's statement, let me say that it so happens that I have been in Russia on two different occasions, and spent some little time there. I was one of the first Senators to come back here and advocate the recognition of the Russian Government. When I advocated doing that, many newspapers that now are shouting for Russia and proclaiming Stalin the greatest man in the world, criticized me. Some of them went so far as to suggest that I be deported because I was for the recognition of the Russian Government.

However, I was in favor of recognizing it, not because I believed in that form of government, but because I felt that the kind of government the Russians should have was none of our business. The position I took, which seems to me to be the correct American position not only now but in the future, is that we should not attempt to tell Stalin and the Russians what kind of a government they should have, or tell the Greeks or the Chinese, or any other peoples what kind of a government they should have. When we start on such a program we not only will have a war every 20 years, but we will have a continuous war on our hands.

I do not know what was the purpose of Admiral Standley's statement. I must confess that I was surprised at his statement, but I have not the slightest doubt that his statement was correct and true, because otherwise he would not have made it.

Incidentally, Admiral Standley, it should be remembered, was one of the strongest—should I say?—interventionists in the United States prior to Pearl Harbor. Admiral Standley was one of those who thoroughly approved of the President's foreign policy, and made speeches in favor of it from one end of the country to the other. So it cannot be said that he was an "isolationist," whatever that is.

The reason why Stalin is not telling the Russians of the aid we are giving them is because, as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said, Stalin is a realist. Stalin is for the Communist Party and its principles first; and, secondly, Stalin is for Russia, and Russia alone. He is a realist. He has stated repeatedly that what he wanted to do was to recover Russian territory. He is not for the four freedoms, and he has never committed himself as being for them. He could not commit himself to the "four freedoms" and still be for communism. He is a realist to the extent that he knows that he could not put the "four freedoms" into effect even if he wanted to do so.

So we should be frank and honest with the American people. They are not children. They know more than many of the so-called leaders in Washington give them credit for knowing. They are not fooled by the foolish statements which are being made by many people who say that they are going to reform the world or that they aim to reform the world. The American people want to know now what Stalin intends to do after the war. What is his program?

A short time ago a man came into my office, and I asked him to sit down. He said, "You know, I do not agree with you, and so I do not want to get into an argument with you."

I asked, "What do you not agree with me about?"

He replied, "I do not agree with you on your post-war views."

I said, "Will you tell me what my post-war views are? I do not know what they are. If you will tell me what part Russia is going to play and what part England is going to play and what part Germany is going to play, then I will tell you what my views are."

For anyone to say today what his views are on the post-war situation, without knowing the part that the realist Stalin is going to play, is nonsensical and silly; and the American people are being misled if they believe what is said by anyone who thinks he can tell them what part Stalin is going to play or how much he has departed from the philosophy of Lenin and Trotsky. I do not believe Stalin has changed or that he will change. Stalin is no fool; he is clever. He knows that Churchill is not for communism, and he knows America is not for communism. The American people believe the Russians are a great race, great fighters, and good people, but we also know that communism was forced upon them. Stalin does not dare to let his people know all we have done for them. He does not dare to let them know how much better off the people in America are. He knows he could not hold them if he did.

I apologize for taking up so much time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Montana has said, a long time ago, speaking on the floor of the Senate, I drew the conclusion that no one could cut the cloth until an international pattern had been devised. Of course, that pattern is not definite. Because of the various factors mentioned by the distinguished Senator, and because of other imponderables which will arise in the future, we do not know what the pattern will be.

However, now that this matter has been brought into the picture, I desire to mention something else before I proceed with my remarks. It appears that in the near future, Mr. President, a number of conferences are going to be held in Washington—conferences on problems dealing with international food supplies, with economic problems in reconstruction, with freedom of the air, and with the so-called world order.

A number of those conferences are going to be held in Washington.

Let me say that I am glad to see the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee again in the Chamber. Last week I called attention to the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee had not given any consideration to the resolution which I have heretofore offered, Senate Resolution No. 22. I am hopeful that the resolution will receive consideration soon. I mean to say that I hope the Chief Executive of the Nation will give the resolution the green light. He and the Secretary of State are the ones who are holding it up. The resolution provides for a liaison committee between the Executive and the Senate; and it provides that the President shall appoint from the liaison committee one or more Senators to serve with other conferees representing this Government at the various conferences which are going to be held in Washington in the near future.

See how important that is? The President or his advisers certainly are slipping in their political acumen if they do not appreciate the fact that the country does not want the planning for the post-war period to be a one-man show. The people are fighting this war, paying for it in blood, sweat, tears, and cash; and they want something to say about the international planning. They want to be heard in the conferences which are to be held in Washington. They are sick and tired of all this national planning, which in so many instances has missed the boat. They want their representatives in on what is being planned internationally.

Therefore, Mr. President, I repeat that I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will see to it that my resolution is given consideration before his committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the Senator from Texas will be very glad to contribute to that end. I feel sure that the committee will give the Senator's resolution consideration; but the Senator realizes, I am sure, that the committee has been under a great deal of pressure, and continues to be under a great deal of pressure at the moment. We shall certainly be very happy to afford the Senator an opportunity to appear before the committee and to present his views, and we shall be glad to appoint a subcommittee to consider the measure. I do not want the Senator to feel that the committee will in any wise exhibit any discourtesy or lack of appreciation.

Let me say to the Senator, if he will permit me to speak for a moment in relation to what the Senator from Montana said about Russia and in relation to what was stated this morning by the Senator from Michigan about some reported remarks of the Vice President relative to what would be the situation if we were to double-cross Russia, that I have not read the Vice President's remarks in detail, so I do not know exactly what he said. However, I desire to say

that the United States is not going to double-cross Russia; it is not going to double-cross any other nation. It is not going to double-cross any nation either in war or in the peace conference. I do not think there is any possibility of having such a thing happen. The United States in all the negotiations and in this war is not pursuing a sordid policy. Its policy is not one of selfishness; it is not one of being covetous of our neighbors' lands; it is not one of seeking indemnity. We want to bring under our sway no foreign citizen as a subject of the United States. We are fighting for our institutions and for our life; and let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the United States will not, with my consent, and I do not believe with his consent, ever double-cross the great Russian people or any other people with whom we may be associated in the joint enterprise of winning this war and winning the peace after the war.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Texas for his assurance that he will give me an opportunity to be heard before his committee on the question of my resolution, Senate Resolution No. 22. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Texas for a moment further, I should like to impress upon him the fact that the resolution is not merely an ordinary resolution. Lawyer as he is, he knows that the treaty-making power of this country is lodged in the Senate and in the President. Historian as he is, he has in his mind the situation which has run down through the years, that when there was lack of cooperation between the Executive and the Senate, treaties did not come into being.

All my resolution would do would be to create what I call a foreign relations advisory council. It would request the President to create such a council, made up of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State and his experts and such other Senators as the President might desire to designate. Thus a liaison committee would be created. I repeat, every great newspaper in this country and many magazines have acknowledged the practicability of this proposal, and yet, for some months, no action has been taken. Now let us go into action on it and create such a committee.

To all the conferences, Mr. President, which will be held in the city of Washington in the near future the President would appoint from such liaison committee one Senator who would then virtually be the representative of the Senate and would feed back into the committee the information obtained. In other words, the thing we are talking about today and which we are fearful will be lacking between Russia and the United States, to-wit, collaboration and coop-

eration, would exist if there were such a liaison committee. I repeat, some of the best minds of this country have been in favor of it, and yet I have been able to get nowhere.

FREEDOM OF PRESS AND RADIO

Now, Mr. President, I desire to proceed to the subject of the freedom of the press and radio. In recent months we have heard a great many comments concerning the curtailment of news pulp for newspapers, the censorship policies of the Government, the F. C. C. licensing policies, Government use of the press, Government use of radio, and the invasion of government into the publishing business. Perhaps it will serve a constructive purpose for us to briefly review these subjects today. I may say, parenthetically, that I shall not repeat anything which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] said.

Before presenting this review, it may also serve some constructive purpose to survey the chronology of Nazi press and radio control in Germany and to study Fascist control of the press in Italy, along with the control of wireless telegraphy and telephony in Italy.

We should likewise be conversant with the control of the press and radio in Japan.

Mr. President, no comprehensive, inclusive survey of the control of press and radio in Japan and Italy and Germany has ever been made. In the past few weeks I have been working with the Library of Congress in an effort to assemble such a survey which I believe should be available to every Member of Congress.

The Library of Congress has had made for me translations from which there has been culled the information contained in the remarks I am now making.

First, let us consider the chronology of Nazi press and radio control in Germany.

In Germany the press law of May 7, 1874, recognized the principle of freedom of the press and merely prescribed certain rules for the exercise of this right.

In 1919 the republican constitution in Germany included in its definite statement of the freedom of publication—

“ . . . there shall be no censorship
“ . . . (except) against obscene literature
for the protection of minors.

In 1922, when the Republic and its institutions were under serious attack, legal measures were provided for matters which might endanger the Republic, but publications were considered private affairs over which the state had only such control as was absolutely necessary to safeguard the public welfare.

By February 25, 1920, the National Socialist Party program had been adopted and demanded—point 23:

Legislative combat against conscious political lies and dissemination thereof through the press.

By 1924 Hitler, in *Mein Kampf*, wrote:

It (the state) has to watch especially the press . . . not temporarily, but permanently; . . . must assure itself with ruthless determination of this means for educating the people, and put it into the service of the state and nation.

In 1931 the N. S. D. A. P. demanded measures to make the press German—that is, free from Jewish influence—and the suppression of newspapers which injure the public welfare.

By March of 1931 there was a German presidential decree for defense against political excesses, permitting police measures against publications endangering public security. The execution of this decree was left to local authorities, but the minister of the interior could request police action.

On January 30, 1933, the National Socialists came into power. By February 4 of 1933 there was a presidential decree for the defense of the German people which said:

Printed matter, the contents of which might endanger the public security and order, may be seized and withdrawn by the police.

On February 28, 1933, there was a presidential decree for the defense of the people and state which declared various articles of the constitution inoperative. That included the statement of 1919 about the freedom of publication and the freedom from censorship. Various articles of the constitution, including this one, were declared inoperative until further notice and the decree further declared:

Therefore limitations . . . of the right of free expression of opinion, including freedom of the press . . . are permissible even beyond the legal limitations otherwise applicable.

By March 17, 1933, there was a presidential order for the creation of a Reich Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda.

By June 30, 1933, there had been a clarification of tasks and jurisdiction of the propaganda ministry including jurisdiction and legislative authority over the press, radio, art, and the theater.

This group, incidentally, was headed since its creation by Dr. Goebbels. As a matter of fact, it grew out of Goebbels' Reich propaganda division of the National Socialist Party.

On September 22, 1933, there was a law written for the creation of the Reich Chamber of Culture. Point 25 in that law provides for the corporate state structure. Provision is made in this law for the creation of six chambers, namely, literature, press, radio, theater, music, and fine arts. The propaganda minister is given full legislative and administrative power for carrying the law into effect.

On November 1, 1933, Dr. Goebbels issued the first decree under the authority of the law I have just mentioned. His decree provided for organization and mandatory membership for anyone connected with any “intellectual creation or achievement presented to the public by means of print, film, or radio.” That decree of November 1, 1933, was put into effect by a further decree of the propaganda minister on November 9, 1933.

On October 4, 1933, we find a law policy in existence relating to all newspapers and publications and terming them a “public task regulated by the state in this law.”

On December 20, 1933, a decree put that law into effect as of January 1.

On November 12, 1934, there was a regulation to implement the unity of party and state. The control of the propaganda minister was established over the activities of the various chambers and the press chamber and radio activities.

Between January 1933 and December 1934 hundreds of leftist newspapers and periodicals were suppressed. Periodically, religious and semireligious publications were banned. Some publications, such as the famous *Ullstein* and *Mosse* newspapers, were reorganized.

Every important newspaper has a representative in Berlin. Once every day these representatives are given instructions by the Propaganda Ministry relative to the treatment to be accorded various news items. These conferences are secret and the revelation of the proceedings outside the circle is said to have cost one newspaper representative penal servitude for life.

Newspapers of lesser importance receive their instructions from the local offices of the Propaganda Ministry.

The German News Agency, DNB, usually termed the “official German news agency,” is practically an agency of the Government and it is recognized as a means of controlling the news at its source. This news agency has a monopoly in the distribution of news in Germany.

On April 10, 1935, the control of non-periodical literature was channeled through the Literature Chamber and there is evidence that nonperiodical literature was brought under complete control.

On May 31, 1938, a decree was issued to provide that prior to any definite registration in the professional list, the chairman of the state unit of the Press Federation must afford the gauleiter—the chief of the National Socialist Party in each district of the Reich—an opportunity to examine the question whether the applicant is politically reliable.

They start with the Constitution to protect them, but in the course of 5 years it is swept aside and they are told that a gauleiter shall determine whether they are for the regime in control; that is, whether they are politically reliable.

Briefly, Mr. President, Germany started with a press law which recognized the principle of freedom of the press. Germany had a constitutional provision which provided for freedom of publication. Then control was extended wherever it was deemed necessary to “safeguard the public welfare.” Then the National Socialist Party began to fight “conscious political lies and dissemination thereof through the press.” Then Hitler began to express his doctrine that the press must be “put into the service of the state and nation.”

Ah, Mr. President, I say again, we come to the time in Germany when, instead of being a free agent, the press must be put into the service of the state and the nation.

Then there was a broadening of the definitions against newspapers which “injure the public welfare,” then a decree

to permit police measures against publications endangering public security. Then there was a presidential decree that printed matter could be seized and withdrawn by the police. Then there was further censorship, and finally there was created a ministry for public enlightenment and propaganda. The authority of this agency was extended over press, radio, art, theater, and films. Then gradually certain publications were banned and some newspapers were "reorganized." Finally newspaper representatives were told by the propaganda ministry what they could print, and there was created a news agency—an official news agency—which began to be a means of controlling the news at its source. Finally there was control of nonperiodical literature, and ultimately there was investigation as to whether or not writers were "politically reliable."

That, Mr. President, is the history of Nazi press and radio control.

It is not my purpose to find any disastrous parallel in our Nation, nor is it my purpose to contend that writers in this country who are not "politically reliable" are scrutinized very sharply by the administration. I merely present this chronology of Nazi press and radio control in Germany as a document which I believe warrants study by every thinking American who is concerned with the maintenance of the "four freedoms."

Now let us briefly consider the control of the press and radio in Japan.

In Japan the press and radio met with government difficulties almost from their earliest existence, in 1861. The Japanese press was not well established until 1872. From its very inception it was used to serve imperialistic interest, and for administration propaganda. Most of the newspapers were founded by government officials, and publications which did not champion one of the government departments found themselves either confined solely to cultural and social affairs or, if any approach was made toward independence in political matters, found themselves subject to severe governmental punishment.

Even those newspapers which were consistently conservative earned the opposition of the bureaucrats. The press laws were stringent, and there was almost no Socialist and labor press.

The constitution of 1890 gave to the people of Japan the right of "freedom of speech in publication, printing, assemblage, and association within the scope of the law," but in practice this was not workable because of stringent laws which were applied. Laws and orders and decrees controlled the press, even to the extent of possible suspension. Until 1897 the Minister of Interior was allowed to judge and punish the violators of both laws and ordinances. Later the punishment of an editor or publisher was turned over to the courts, but the censorship of all publications is in the hands of the Police Bureau of the Department of Interior, and has been since 1921. Newspapers, as well as scientific and literary circles, have felt the pressure of government, and controls are exercised by means of police bans on the discussion of certain subjects.

It was inevitable that this control should be extended to the radio. Radio broadcasting in Japan began privately in 1921. By December 1923 there were regulations. Through the assistance of the Department of Communications there was created a trust which incorporated three private broadcasting systems by 1925. In August of 1926 the Japanese Broadcasting Corporation absorbed these three systems into one merger. After that a 1-yen initiation fee was required of radio owners and collected by the Government. In 1930 there were eight stations, and in 1932 the Government imposed an additional levy. By 1933 there were four Japanese radio stations outside of Japan proper—two in Formosa, one in Korea, and one in Manchuria. The whole system was nationalized. It was a very official proposition. It was government-made, government-controlled, and government-exploited by 1933.

In 1936 a news agency was created. It was known as the Domei Tsushin Sha. The business of this group was to "circulate correct information or the raw material for the formation of sound public opinion." A man named Shohei Fujinuma was Chief Secretary of the Cabinet. He was the Japanese Dr. Goebbels. At that time there was an Army, Navy, and Cabinet Information Bureau. It was a kind of propaganda ministry, and it encouraged the merging of small news agencies, so that the Allied News Agency was placed completely under official direction.

Penalties for evading government direction became increasingly severe. By 1937 control was established in the Home Office and War Office. The fines became heavier, and by 1939 it was a criminal offense to be found in possession of a radio set capable of receiving broadcasts from the outside world. Foreign residents were not exempt. Incidentally, in 1941 one observer wrote of the control of the Japanese military clique as "journalistic string pulling of bureaucrats which colors news beyond belief."

The Japanese legislation in 1939 included laws and regulations of a more stringent nature than any which preceded World War No. 2, and on March 25, 1939, there was enacted a law for safeguarding secrets of military material resources. It included a provision for the inspection of books, and it enabled officers to conduct investigations and ask questions.

This law was supplemented by another law on June 23, 1939, and by still another law on April 11, 1939, which placed all international telecommunications at the disposal of the Government.

On April 1, 1939, there was a national general mobilization law which controlled communications materials and services concerning information, enlightenment and propaganda. This law was revised by the law of March 1, 1941.

On March 6, 1941, another national defense security law was enacted and on March 8, 1941, there was a new peace preservation law which related to propaganda.

On March 28, 1941, the foreign exchange control law was enacted, and this law, of course, could reach the press

through its official inspection of business conditions.

That, Mr. President, is a chronology of the control of press and radio in Japan. It is interesting to note that the Japanese press has never tolerated independence in political matters. It is interesting to note that the bureaucrats of Japan would not permit a free and independent press.

The chronology of Fascist control of the press in Italy is equally interesting.

On July 8, 1924, there was an Italian decree which empowered the police prefects to confiscate any issue of a newspaper without bringing a charge before the court.

On July 12, 1924, there were issued certain regulations concerning the promulgation of the edict of 1848 which dealt with the press.

By early December of 1924 the minister of justice prepared a decree which has been applied to all opposition papers, and which defines as a crime the publication of news "which might have an injurious effect on national credit at home and abroad, or cause alarm among the population or give rise to disturbance of the public peace or prejudice the diplomatic activities of the government and its relations abroad." That, Mr. President, is interpreted as granting government officials immunity from criticism for acts of office. This measure also reintroduced preventive confiscation, and provided for the suspension of the paper.

On January 8, 1925, 111 members of the opposition read a document attacking the regime, and the paper was suppressed for publishing it. By the early part of January, 1925, 102 newspapers had been suppressed under the new regulations, and the following month other editions were confiscated. In February of 1925 still more editions were confiscated.

In October there were further reprisals against an attempt to issue independent newspapers, and by October 23, 1925, George Seldes, an American correspondent, was expelled for publishing the document of the opposition. He was expelled for "representing the Mussolini government in the worst possible light and giving the views of the political opponents of the Duce."

By November 18, 1925, other so-called antinational papers were suppressed, and by December 31, 1925, the public prosecutor had authority to prohibit the appearance of any paper twice condemned for press offenses. The printers themselves were made liable for all fines incurred by the papers they printed, and the local press association had to enroll the names of all editors. Only Fascist unions were permitted to enroll.

By January 7, 1926, the Home Secretary had issued a circular which indicated that in ordering the confiscation of an issue, the prefects need not trouble to determine whether an item was false or true. "The preservation of order is an elementary and primary duty of every government and is independent of any opinion that may be held as to the bad faith of the person who endangers the order."

By October 1926 there were only 27 papers left after a general suspension by

Fascists. Sixteen of these papers were dailies.

By October 31, 1926, after Anteo Zamboni had tried to kill Mussolini, all 27 papers were suspended for an indefinite period, and 4 were suspended for 20 days.

By March 12, 1927, the Central Executive Board of the National Federation of the Press had divided newspapermen into four classes: (1) Fascist Party members, (2) nonparty members with a clean past, (3) former anti-Fascists who had repented, and (4) the unredeemed. All other newspapermen were divided into two classes: Those officially recognized by the party, and the remainder.

By February 26, 1928, Law No. 384 had provided that no editor or any journal or journalist could exercise his profession except after enrollment in the official register, which is permitted only by the Government. There is no appeal from a refusal.

On June 13, 1935, a representative of the Chicago Tribune was expelled from Rome for an article on the shakiness of Italian finance. As far as I know, incidentally, no representative of the Chicago Tribune has ever been barred from Rome for any articles on the shakiness of New Deal finance.

By December 7, 1935, the powers of censorship of the Minister of Propaganda and the press were extended, and propaganda officials were empowered to order police anywhere to seize newspapers and books without instruction from the Minister of the Interior—who, by the way, was also Il Duce.

By August of 1936 the press had received instructions concerning some 25 explicit items which they could not mention, and throughout 1937 there were more specific instructions to the press dealing with certain detailed news items which must be treated in a certain way.

By 1938 the Italian Minister of Education had set up a committee to examine all post-war publications in order to eliminate all elements politically hostile to the principles of the Italian regime. A list of banned books was to be prepared and in the future publications were to be censored before issued.

I am sure that all can recall that on April 29, 1940, the Italians put the pressure on the Osservatore Romano for its pro-ally stand, and by May 14, 1940, the street sales of the Osservatore Romano outside the Vatican City were prohibited, and the paper dropped its war news column.

Mr. President, the control of wireless telegraphy and telephony in Italy is another very interesting subject to all those who are interested in the preservation of freedom, but it is a detailed subject, and I will not attempt to discuss it at this time, though I am now preparing a memorandum which I expect to insert in the RECORD at a later date. I can say that there are very rigid Italian regulations for broadcasting, and that the penalties for violation of the Italian code in this connection are extremely rigid.

I have given, Mr. President, the story of Fascist control of the press in Italy. It is the story of a political party and a political leader, who permitted no criticism, and who divided all newspaper

writers into classifications in respect to the degree of their loyalty to him and to his party. It is the story of a leader who was very intolerant of those who in their writings or in their verbal utterances disagreed with him or with his party.

Senators are all familiar with the First War Powers Act and with the Second War Powers Act, and with the provisions in these acts which relate to the utilization of vital war information.

We are familiar with the sweeping Executive orders which clapped secrecy and censorship rules on hundreds of commercial plants. We can recall that away back in 1939 there were protests of the Federal Communications Commission against any restrictions on the free flow of information to the United States from any source whatever within or outside the United States.

In 1939, as this Nation observed the 150th anniversary of the Bill of Rights, there was apprehension over the fate of some parts of our charter of liberty in the event that we should be drawn into war. The first among the 10 amendments which were enacted more than a century and a half ago provided that Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The whole question of press censorship was discussed the latter part of February 1941 after the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. George C. Marshall, had testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. The publication of that testimony brought up the whole question of the place of the press and the radio in times of war. High ranking officials in the national defense organization submitted plans for the censorship of press and radio which would have established a tight central control by officers of the armed services over information about national defense, but that plan was discarded early in 1941. According to reports it had been presented to the Chief Executive in June of 1940.

By the latter part of February 1941 the American press was cooperating voluntarily with the United States, Canada, and England, and voluntarily withholding certain items in the public interest. By October of 1941 there appeared to be a general agreement that we needed a clearly defined censorship policy rather than a voluntary policy.

When the foremost editors of the Nation gathered in Washington for their annual conference on April 17, 1941, the biggest problem confronting them was Government news censorship. At that time most of official Washington was free from censorship, though there were certain notable exceptions. When the President sent a message to the American Society of Newspaper Editors he went all out for a free press. It was evident, however, that in a democratic country which was technically at peace it was impossible to keep the lid on military secrets,

By the latter part of May 1941 newspapers were editorializing on the creation of the Office of Government Reports, apparently designed as a permanent superpublicity agency clothed with statutory authority. This agency was closely scrutinized as a funnel of all Government information which might technically have been a step toward the abandonment of the freedom of the press in America.

This agency, incidentally, in no way supplanted all the other publicity bureaus and press agencies in the various Government departments. More recently the Byrd Committee on Executive Reorganization reported more than 300 general publicity writers in the Federal agencies, and their number at that time was estimated at as high as 700. The propaganda at that time amounted to about 100,000,000 pounds a year and cost about \$25,000,000 for paper and printing. I will return to this subject a little later.

The Chief Executive made an excellent start toward the right sort of censorship. He picked out a good man to be the Director of Censorship when he selected Mr. Byron Price, of the Associated Press. The cooperation of the fourth estate was complete and enthusiastic.

The whole theory of press censorship in the closing days of 1941 was that it would be used to keep essential military information from the enemy, and it was distinctly understood that it would not be used to keep any incompetency from public discussion. The American press and the publishing world in general accepted in good faith the code issued by the Director of Censorship. This code was issued by the 15th of January in 1942. Broadcasting stations, incidentally, were under more stringent censorship than the press, because radio is not domestic in any sense of the word.

By February 8 of last year the White House had ordered all Cabinet and other high-ranking officials to submit their future speeches to the Office of Facts and Figures for advance clearance. Shortly after that the Office of Censorship issued regulations concerning international communication.

By March 19 regulations adapting the 1917 Trading with the Enemy Act to the needs of the present war were issued by the Secretary of the Treasury in conjunction with Byron Price, the Censorship Director. By April 1 there seemed to be some confusion about our censorship policies, and there was talk of reorganizing the overlapping and contradictory wartime information services, perhaps into a centralized agency with a unified policy for the dissemination of war news.

Three months after our entry into the global war our military censorship of news was more stringent than ever before in our history. There was some public confusion in March of 1942 because there had been a suppression of facts already known to the enemy, and a number of editorial writers throughout the Nation began to talk about the incompetence and the blundering of our press-relations policy.

By April of 1942 it was evident that freedom of the press was on trial. It was

also evident that we were standing at the crossroads between voluntary censorship and compulsory censorship, and the newspaper industry was facing a supreme crisis. There was some apprehension by May of last year that the administration was attempting to cripple the newspapers and suppress all criticism of its policies.

On June 25, 1942, the Office of Censorship published a revision of the code of wartime practices for newspapers and radio stations, which placed channels of public information more firmly under the administration control. Under the revised code important news relating to the operation of the war effort could not be printed or broadcast unless it had been released by appropriate authority or passed by censorship. The new sections of the radio code paralleled the press code in most particulars. Also new restrictions of a general nature were added.

By the latter part of September of last year there were grave issues as to what information endangered the security of the United States, and whether military censorship was being used to conceal nonmilitary purposes. Capital correspondents began to call for a showdown on censorship policies, and there were a number of protests on the way silence was imposed under the voluntary code. There was a continual expression of alarm over the creeping suppression which many people felt was a threat to a free press in wartime.

By December of last year the Office of Censorship was on a hot spot in connection with censorship legislation. It will be recalled that on November 30 of last year the Senate recalled from the House of Representatives a bill it had unanimously adopted authorizing the censorship of all communications between the United States and its Territorial possessions.

The withholding by the administration of the details concerning damages suffered in the sneak Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor met with widespread criticism.

The Office of War Information, originally intended to coordinate and control the release of war information, was helpless when the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Petroleum Administration battled over the wording of a press release on the suspension of gasoline rationing cards in the East. We are told that as a consequence, news of the suspension leaked out prematurely. The same kind of muddling occurred on the announcement of canned goods rationing more recently.

By the 5th of last month the Office of Censorship had issued new and consolidated regulations governing all communications entering and leaving this country. There was a great deal of comment concerning the Allied censorship in north Africa early this year.

My own feeling is that our censorship of news must not be permitted to destroy the faith of the people in their Government. There is no excuse for the muddling of administration announcements concerning recent rationing policies. Today press and radio are regulated as to what they can tell the public,

and we have a pretty definite organization to see that voluntary censorship is followed.

The Chief of the Office of War Information has authority to control all war information, but I do not believe that he has ever exercised this control of the War and Navy information services. It is my understanding that they still issue all their own releases, and that the Office of War Information intervenes only when the War and Navy Departments make joint announcements with other war agencies.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. President, I now desire to speak about Government propaganda, which was somewhat stressed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], but I have some additional information which might supplement what he has already said.

At the present time old-line Government departments like the Department of Labor, the Treasury, and the others, maintain their own publicity organizations, as does every agency. It has been said that there are more than 30,000 press agents and publicity aides on the pay roll. How many million dollars a year that costs it is hard to say. The Office of War Information this year may need a total of about 4,400 people to conduct propaganda activities at home and abroad. That would cost about \$37,000,000. Our overseas propaganda by the Office of War Information may cost about \$27,000,000 in this fiscal year.

Mr. President, I believe that the American press has retained a remarkable degree of freedom in a world of rigid restrictions, and I believe that the American press has done an outstanding job of self-government. I have no quarrel with the general censorship provisions, though I do believe it is apparent that we need a further clarification of policy and a definite coordination of all activities relating to press and radio. It is obvious that even our present system offers possibilities for potential abuse. Against these possibilities we must constantly be on the alert.

Along with the censorship policies of Government, I think we must be aware of certain mechanical limitations which have been imposed upon the press. I think it is apparent that some of the attempts of Government to put press associations under the power of Congress to regulate commerce had in them the germ of rigid Government control.

The restrictions on news pulp also have in them the germ of rigid Government control. American newspapers began rationing newsprint with the new year, and our rationing has been on the basis of 1941 usage. The rationing of newsprint may be a necessary step, but it is certainly inconsistent with the extended publication activities of Government itself, and with the fact that Government itself is utilizing more and more space in American newspapers which leaves less and less space available for a free American press.

As every Senator knows, in January of this year the W. P. B. ordered the use of newsprint in 1943 limited to the ton-

nage used by each publisher to produce his net paid circulation in 1941 plus a 3-percent spoilage allowance.

During the last war, when there were shortages, the Government laid the facts before the representatives of all the industries involved. The plans were drafted and put into effect on a voluntary basis. These were cooperative restrictions, and they were by and large successful. That policy has not been followed effectively in the present war.

The amount of print paper which big publishers may use during the present year has also been cut by a pattern similar to that which was applied to newspaper and magazine publishers. It is apparent that this curtailment order could seriously threaten the press of the Nation.

Perhaps the best evidence of any need for curtailment in the amount of news pulp available to newspapers should be given by Government itself. Here in Washington the Government issues a snowstorm of news releases which are apparently still considered as essential. It has been said that the Public Printer in Washington is estimating a 50-percent increase in the use of paper in 1943 over 1942.

Think of it; we are telling the citizens of this country to curtail, yet these agencies are flooding the country, and a large percentage of what they use in flooding it is mere rot.

There have also been rumors in Washington that the Office of War Information would begin to issue a 4- to 6-page summary of the week's news in Washington. I am not going to comment on the pulp outlook, though a number of experts contend that the pulp outlook has improved. I am going to comment briefly on the publishing activities of Government itself.

Remember, in Germany, Italy, and Japan the government took over publishing activities. In this country we have gone wild in putting into the hands of Government some 50,000 paid newspapermen to publicize Government activities. On top of that we flood this country with carloads of material every day. Then the Government is reaching down and buying space in the newspapers of the country, getting space, interfering with the free press. As stated by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], the Government publication, Victory, has already been discussed on the floor of the Senate. It is only a small part of the material coming from the presses of the Government itself as a war publisher.

There are tens of millions of posters issued by the Office of War Information.

The Office of War Information maintains a publications and graphic bureau, and some of their publications run to almost 3,000,000 copies. Their pamphlets range from 16 to 32 pages. Some of them are simple, pocket-size numbers, and some of them are profusely illustrated publications.

Some of the volume of Government publicity was cut late last year, but it still has not stopped the torrent of Government publications, and it cannot be

denied that some of the O. W. I. publications reflect party politics. I must confess also that I am alarmed by the statement of the O. W. I. last month to the effect that the O. W. I. was going to take over all Government farm news.

Mr. President, I am alarmed also by the statement of the O. W. I. that it would take over the control of almost all Government news agencies.

I refuse, however, to believe that this administration is contemplating the publication of a Government-owned daily newspaper published at the taxpayers' expense.

It is apparent from all of the foregoing that Congress must closely scrutinize all the publication activities of Government, and it is equally apparent that the behind-the-scenes conflicts between the O. W. I. and the Office of Strategic Services must be definitely and permanently settled so that we do not have conflicts in the field of our psychological warfare. At the outset of 1943 we still had no agreed policy or coordinated program for psychological warfare—we still had no completely unified effort, though we had a half dozen agencies working on parts of the job.

It is equally apparent that we must separate our propaganda and censorship activities or else correlate them so that they do not create confusion.

We are fighting for the four freedoms and we must fight for freedom of the press at home. Last September the American press blew the lid off the issue of censorship, and one of our great journalists wrote about the creeping paralysis of that censorship and wrote about power-hungry bureaucrats.

Last February there was a proposal which would have made it a criminal offense to divulge the contents of any Government document marked "confidential." If that proposal had been enacted into law, then any officeholder with something to conceal could have gotten out of the reach of journalistic investigators.

Mr. President, we know that the press has continually endeavored to expose any bureaucratic and brass-hat incompetence. We know that the press exposed the misuse of the W. P. A. for political purposes. We know that the press stopped the plan to pack the Supreme Court. We know that the press ruined the 1938 congressional purge, but we also know that the press has played a major role in the war effort. It has made the American people aware of the menace of inflation. It made it possible to amend the selective service legislation. It made it possible to have gasoline rationing and it made the scrap drive successful.

The American press has donated nearly \$100,000,000 in space for war purposes. The American press made it possible for Henry Kaiser to do a job in the face of mobback opposition.

The American press made it possible to secure a clarification of the rubber issue. It exposed the early fan-dancer defects in the Office of Civilian Defense. It has continually pounded away on the issue of one-man control over war production.

It does not regard the New Deal and the war, in the words of Stanley High, as "joint and inseparable enterprises."

Mr. President, in conclusion, the encroachments on a free and untrammelled expression of public opinion elsewhere have sometimes been very gradual. They usually begin as propaganda for a particular administration or a particular leader and they end in complete control of all forms of social communication, so that today German newspapers are mouthpieces of the state, and German newspapers, according to Goebbels, are "sharp instruments of policy" ready to be played on "like a piano."

There, Mr. President, is a master of analysis, telling how the German people are being fooled through the newspapers, because the newspapers are used to be played on "like a piano."

The first freedoms to be lost by any people who are controlled by dictators were the freedom of expression and the freedom of a free press.

The tremendous increase in the publicity and informational activities of the Federal Government, the tremendous increase in material publicizing the Government activities, carries with it a distinct menace for the future.

Today the Federal Communications Commission has a life-and-death power which it can wield over every radio station in the land, and we know that the Chief Executive has the authority to seize any and all radio apparatus and equipment.

Mr. President, we find engraved on the Archives Building in this city the words, "The past is prologue." The only thing that stands between the menace of that absolute power is the Congress of the United States. So, I repeat: It is for us to be alert. We must make sure that on the home front there are no more Pearl Harbors.

Mr. President, we know that the twin threat of censorship and propaganda led France down the long road, from which there was no turning, to ultimate disaster.

I do not believe that these things will happen here. They will not happen here because an enlightened people and a vigilant Congress will never permit them to happen. They will not happen here because no man and no party can be so blind as to eliminate a great safeguard for the perpetuation of freedom.

Mr. President, if "the past is prologue," let us realize that we must take steps different from those taken by the so-called Axis Powers, because there the people lost their rights.

Nevertheless, it is well for us to be conscious of these problems and to pursue a policy of vigilance which will insure the perpetuation of a free press.

In other lands we have seen the first gray afternoon haze of government curtailments and censorship darken into the lengthening twilight shadows of an increasingly inflexible control, and eventually into the thick black night of fettered oblivion, with a dominant competitive government in the propaganda publishing business financed by the public.

Mr. President, that must never happen here, and it never will if the American people and the American Congress remain alert.

PRACTICAL RELIGION IN THE WORLD OF TOMORROW—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, very much has been said today about a certain address delivered by the Vice President recently. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the address which has been referred to so often today. The address was on the subject of practical religion in the world of tomorrow, and was delivered by the Vice President at the Conference on Christian Bases of World Order, held under the auspices of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, at Delaware, Ohio, on March 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are three great philosophies in the world today. The first, based on the supremacy of might over right, says that war between nations is inevitable until such time as a single master race dominates the entire world and everyone is assigned his daily task by an arrogant, self-appointed Fuehrer. The second—the Marxian philosophy—says that class warfare is inevitable until such time as the proletariat comes out on top, everywhere in the world, and can start building a society without classes. The third—which we in this country know as the democratic Christian philosophy—denies that man was made for war, whether it be war between nations or war between classes, and asserts boldly that ultimate peace is inevitable, that all men are brothers, and that God is their Father.

This democratic philosophy pervades not only the hearts and minds of those who live by the Christian religion, both Protestant and Catholic, but of those who draw their inspiration from Mohammedanism, Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism, and other faiths. When we look beneath the outer forms, we find that all these faiths, in one way or another, preach the doctrine of the dignity of each individual human soul, the doctrine that God intended man to be a good neighbor to his fellow man, and the doctrine of the essential unity of the entire world.

Those who think most about individualism preach freedom. Those who think most about unity, whether it be the unity of a nation or of the entire world, preach the sacred obligation of duty. There is a seeming conflict between freedom and duty, and it takes the spirit of democracy to resolve it. Only through religion and education can the freedom-loving individual realize that his greatest private pleasure comes from serving the highest unity, the general welfare of all. This truth, the essence of democracy, must capture the hearts of men over the entire world, if human civilization is not to be torn to pieces in a series of wars and revolutions far more terrible than anything that has yet been endured. Democracy is the hope of civilization.

To understand the significance of these three philosophies dominant in the world today, let us look at each one in turn. During the last 80 years, the outstanding exponent of the sacredness and inevitability of war has been Prussia. By nature the common people of Prussia are simple and hard-working, and make excellent citizens

except where they have become infected by the Prussian doctrine that might makes right. The Prussian philosophy causes its adherents to practice many of the highest virtues, but these virtues are all ultimately placed at the disposal of supreme evil. Hitler, seizing the Prussian militaristic tradition as a powerful instrument in his hands and putting it to use with his own religious frenzy, has become the anti-Christ of this generation—perhaps the most complete anti-Christ who has ever lived. It is not enough to bring about the downfall of Hitler. We must understand the origin and growth of the Prussian spirit, and do something to counteract that spirit, if we wish to bring permanent peace.

The Prussian attitude toward war and supremacy has strong roots. Whether it reaches back to the days of Caesar or whether it first took form under the guidance of the Teutonic knights in the Middle Ages, we are certain of this: by the time of Frederick the Great, the Prussians consciously adopted the doctrine of total war and the total state as the chief end of man. Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II modernized and made completely deceitful and ruthless that which Frederick the Great had founded.

Shortly after Kaiser Wilhelm II rose to power, a generation before the First World War, one of the more tender-hearted of the German generals said, in addressing his troops: "Our civilization must build its temple on mountains of corpses, an ocean of tears, and the groans of innumerable dying men."

We know now, to our sorrow, that those were not just idle words. But God grant they will not be true much longer.

Bernhardi and Treitschke, through the printed page and through the classroom, preached the glory of war and the necessity of Germany picking a quarrel with England or France. Frederick the Great, Moltke, and Bismarck were proclaimed as being superior to Goethe, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven. Hegel laid broad and deep the philosophy of the totalitarian state. Other philosophers, and especially Nietzsche, seized on the Darwinian doctrines of natural selection and survival of the fittest to erect a seemingly scientific but false materialism to justify their ruthless acts.

In saying all of this, I do not mean to indicate that Prussia was the only wicked State in the world. England, France, Russia, Spain, and the United States were not always perfect. But Prussia and Japan were the only countries which systematically devoted the highest virtues of their citizenry, generation after generation, to the glorification of the state and to the ruthlessness of war.

The ancestors of many of the people of German origin in the United States were members of the minority in Germany who dissented from the extremist tendencies toward militarism. Thousands of these dissenters migrated to this country in the 20 or 30 years after the failure of the revolution of 1848. Their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren today are among our finest American citizens. They are patriotically doing their part in the present war for freedom, and we honor them for the spirit they have shown.

It is in the years since 1848 that the liberal culture of the old Germany has been so completely submerged by the worship of strength and power. In this period of less than a century, under Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Hitler, Germany has launched five aggressive wars.

The result has been that, over the last 30 years, the spirit of Prussianism has cost the lives of at least 20,000,000 men, has crippled at least 10,000,000 others, and has caused the nations of the world to squander hundreds of billions of dollars on death, destruction, and hate. How different things would have

been if this money had been spent instead on peace, prosperity, and understanding.

Germans by blood are neither better nor worse than Englishmen, Americans, Swedes, Poles, or Russians. But the Prussian tradition of the last century, and especially the Nazi education of the last 10 years, have created a psychic entity so monstrous and so dangerous to the entire world that it is absolutely vital to exercise some control over German education when the war comes to an end. Prussian schoolmasters have been of greater importance to the German Army than Prussian captains, and Prussian textbooks have had greater value than ammunition. It is the disciplined will to power and the worship of war as the method of power that have made the German Army such a terrible instrument of force.

Just as Hitler took the Prussian military tradition and organized it into gangsterism, so he took the Prussian education system and streamlined it to marshal the millions of German boys and girls behind his evil conspiracy of world conquest. Hitler's children have been trained to believe implicitly that the State is more important than the individual, and that the individual must be willing and ready to sacrifice himself for the German Nation and for the Fuehrer. Starting with the young mothers and fathers, married or unmarried, and taking the children through the day nurseries and a series of schools for different ages, Hitler has indoctrinated the German children with what he calls his leadership principle—that among men as in nature there is an eternal struggle between the weak and the strong, and that the decadent democracies are destined to crumble before the superior might of the Nazi elite. German boys have been systematically trained in brutality. German girls have been systematically trained to believe that their supreme duty is to be mothers, married or unmarried, of children dedicated to the service of the fatherland and the Fuehrer. Through the use of mystic ceremonies—pagan dances, bonfires, sun festivals on mountain tops, and many other types of ritual—both boys and girls have been trained to look upon Hitler as divine and they pray to him as God.

The evil influence of this systematic degradation of millions of German boys and girls cannot be counteracted in a short time. Even Hitler's death will not end it, because many of Hitler's children, conditioned as they are, will believe that he is still their leader, in the spirit if not in the flesh. Hitler dead may be almost as dangerous as Hitler alive.

This, then, is the vastly difficult problem with which the United Nations will have to cope, if the victory which now is coming closer is to bring more than just a short breathing spell before another Prussian attack is launched upon the world.

It is not up to the United Nations to say just what the German schools of the future should teach, and we do not want to be guilty of a Hitler-like orgy of book burning. But it is vital to the peace of the world to make sure that neither Prussianism, Hitlerism nor any modification of them is taught. There are many cultured German scholars with an excellent attitude toward the world who should be put to work on the job of re-writing the German textbooks in their own way. I believe these men would glorify peace and international honesty, reestablishment of the German culture of Beethoven, Schubert, Schiller, and Goethe, and the gradual preparation of the German spirit for an appreciation of the fact that a bill of rights for the individual is as vital as a bill of duties toward the state.

Doubtless thousands of German boys will come home from the war bitterly disillusioned of Prussianism and Hitlerism. Thousands of both young and old at home will feel the same way. They will honestly want

to help build up a new democratic Germany, and we, without yielding at all to the old warlike spirit of Prussia, should encourage them to try. We shall need the help of all Germans who give convincing evidence that they do not subscribe to the master-race myth and are genuinely opposed to the doctrine that might makes right. The re-education we insist upon should not crush out any sincere desire to practice democracy and live at peace among the world family of nations.

It will not be necessary for Americans to teach in the German schools. The all-important thing is to see that the cult of war and international deceit is no longer preached as a virtue in the schools. We cannot countenance the soft, lazy forgetfulness which characterized England and France in their treatment of Germany in the thirties. The cost of such short-sighted appeasement is too great in men and money. We must not go down that mistaken, tragic road again.

All of my discussion thus far has been concerned with Prussianism. Now I want to talk about Marxism. This philosophy in some ways is the child of Prussianism, because Marx, its high priest, was molded in his thinking by Hegel, the great philosopher of the Prussian state. Marxism has used the Cheka, just as Prussianism has used the Gestapo, but it has never preached international war as an instrument of national policy. It does not believe one race is superior to another. Many of the Marxian activities of the last 10 years which people of the West have most condemned have been inspired by fear of Germany. The Russian people, who are the chief believers in Marxism, are fundamentally more religious than the Prussians. The great mass of the Russian people is still hungry for spiritual food. The Russians have a better opportunity to find that spiritual food than have the Prussians under their regime, which glorifies the violence of the old Teutonic gods.

This question of religious freedom in Russia has been getting attention from the Church of England and from the Roman Catholic Church in this country. In a recent issue of the magazine *Commonweal*, which surely cannot be said to have Marxian leanings, the managing editor discussed two books by exiled Russians on the status of religion in Russia. Quoting from both books, one written under the auspices of the Church of England, and the other by a professor at Fordham University, the editor came to the conclusion that the position of the Christian Church in Russia has definitely improved.

The future well-being of the world depends upon the extent to which Marxism, as it is being progressively modified in Russia, and democracy, as we are adapting it to twentieth century conditions, can live together in peace. Old-line Marxism has held that democracy is mere words, that it serves the cause of the common man with platitudes rather than with jobs, and that belief in it results in a weak governmental organization. And we who believe in democracy must admit that modern science, invention, and technology have provided us with new bottles into many of which we have not yet poured the wine of the democratic spirit.

In some respects both the Prussians and the Russians have perceived the signs of the times better than we—and I hope that reactionary politicians will not quote this sentence out of its context, in an effort to prove that I have come out for dictatorship. The fact is that the Prussians have done an effective job of making their bureaucrats efficient in coordinating the social forces in the service of the state. The Russians have put great emphasis on serving and gaining the enthusiastic adherence of the common man. It is my belief that democracy is the only true expression of Christianity, but if it is not to let Christianity down, democracy must

be tremendously more efficient than it has been in the service of the common man, and in resistance to selfish pressure groups.

After this war is over the democratic capitalistic nations will need to prove that they are supremely interested in full employment and full utilization of natural resources. They will need to demonstrate that the consuming power of their people can be made to equal their productive power. The right to work at a regular job and for a decent wage is essential to the true dignity of man.

If the western democracies furnish full employment and an expanding production, they need have no fear of a revival of old-line communistic propaganda from within. If they do not furnish full employment, communistic propaganda of this kind is inevitable and there is nothing which the Russian Government or our Government or any other government can do to stop it. In the event of long-continued unemployment, the only question will be as to whether the Prussian or Marxian doctrine will take us over first.

I believe in the democratic doctrine—the religion based on the social message of the prophets, the heart insight of Christ, and the wisdom of the men who drew up the Constitution of the United States and adopted the Bill of Rights. By tradition and by structure we believe that it is possible to reconcile the freedom and rights of the individual with the duties required of us by the general welfare. We believe in religious tolerance and the separation of church and state, but we need to light again the old spirit to meet the challenge of new facts.

We shall decide some time in 1943 or 1944 whether to plant the seeds for World War No. 3. That war will be certain if we allow Prussia to rearman either materially or psychologically. That war will be probable in case we double-cross Russia. That war will be probable if we fail to demonstrate that we can furnish full employment after this war comes to an end and Fascist interests motivated largely by anti-Russian bias get control of our Government. Unless the western democracies and Russia come to a satisfactory understanding before the war ends, I very much fear that World War No. 3 will be inevitable. Without a close and trusting understanding between Russia and the United States, there is grave probability after this war is over of Russia and Germany sooner or later making common cause.

Of course the ground for World War No. 3 can be laid by actions of the other powers, even though we in the United States follow the most constructive course. For example, such a war would be inevitable if Russia should again embrace the Trotskyist idea of fomenting world-wide revolution, or if British interests should again be sympathetic to anti-Russian activity in Germany and other countries.

Another possible cause of World War No. 3 might rise out of our own willingness to repeat the mistakes we made after World War No. 1. When a creditor nation raises its tariffs and asks foreign nations to pay up, and at the same time refuses to let them pay in goods, the result is irritation of a sort that sooner or later leads first to trade war and then to bloodshed.

The gospel of Christ was to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, comfort the sick, and visit those who were in hard luck. He said that treating your neighbor decently was the way to show that you loved God. The neighborhood in Christ's day was a few miles in diameter. Today the airplane has made the whole world a neighborhood. The good-neighbor policy, whether at home or abroad, is a Christian policy. Those who preach isolationism and hate of other nations are preaching a modified form of Prussian nazism, and the only outcome of such preaching will be war.

If we want peace, we must treat other nations in the spirit of democratic Christian-

ity. We must make our religion practical. In our relations with China, for example, we must act in such a way as to enhance the material as well as the spiritual well-being of her people. So doing will not only be of spiritual advantage to ourselves, will not only do much to prevent war, but will give us more material prosperity than we can otherwise enjoy. And in saying this, I do not preach the missionary spirit as a forerunner of a new imperialism.

Nearly half the people of the world live in eastern Asia. Seven-eighths of them do not know how to read and write, but many of them listen to the radio and they know that the world is on the move and they are determined to move with it. We can at their request help them to move in knowledge toward a higher standard of living rather than in ignorance toward confusion and anarchy.

Throughout history, every big nation has been given an opportunity to help itself by helping the world. If such an opportunity is seized with a broad and generous spirit, an infinitude of practical possibilities opens up. Thousands of businessmen in the United States have seen this kind of thing happen on a smaller scale in their own businesses, as their broad and enlightened policies have increased their prosperity and given jobs to their neighbors. Christianity is not star gazing or foolish idealism. Applied on a world-wide scale, it is intensely practical. Bread cast upon the waters does return. National friendships are remembered. Help to starving people is not soon forgotten. We of the United States who now have the greatest opportunity that ever came to any people do not wish to impose on any other race or to thrust our money or technical experts or ways of thought on those who do not desire them. But we do believe that if we measure up to the responsibility which Providence has placed on our shoulders, we shall be called on for help by many peoples who admire us. When we respond to this cry for help, we shall be manifesting not only a Christian spirit but also obeying a fundamental law of life.

We of the western democracies must demonstrate the practicality of our religion. We must extend a helping hand to China and India; we must be firm and just with Prussia; we must deal honestly and fairly with Russia and be tolerant and even helpful as she works out her economic problems in her own way; we must prove that we ourselves can give an example, in our American democratic way, of full employment and full production for the benefit of the common man.

By collaborating with the rest of the world to put productive resources fully to work, we shall raise our own standard of living and help to raise the standard of living of others. It is not that we shall be taking the bread out of the mouths of our own children to feed the children of others, but that we shall cooperate with everyone to call forth the energies of everyone, to put God's earth more completely at the service of all mankind.

ARTISTS FOR VICTORY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed by the splendid voluntary contribution of the artists of America in dedicating their talents in our united effort for victory. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared on the Nation-wide organization of American artists known as Artists for Victory.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outbreak of the war, 20 art societies formed an organization, known as Artists for

Victory, Inc., for the purpose of doing what they could, in their own field, to assist the country in its war effort. Artists for Victory has since grown to 23 societies, comprising a membership of over 10,000 artists from all parts of the country. All these artists are imbued with a spirit of patriotism and a sincere and strong desire to use their talents for the winning of the war.

As you all know, the war morale is being impressed upon the public with appeals and exhortations via radio, the press, the movies, and other channels. Effective as these means are, they leave little lasting impression. Since the conduct of the war is affected by our fears and passions, our bravery and devotion, our loyalty and courage, and by our sacrifices, the graphic visualization of the themes of the war—to impress them continuously upon our hearts and minds—is a necessary factor in civilian morale. Graphic presentation is in fact a war weapon.

Artists for Victory has effectively demonstrated this in its national war poster competition, out of which 300 posters were selected for exhibition at the National Gallery of Art in Washington from January 17 to February 17. In this exhibition the war slogans which have been resounding throughout the country were given form and color. Artists from practically every State in the Union took part in the great undertaking of making the issues of the war clearly and simply understandable. In this effort fully half a million dollars' worth of art production was created by the artists. They devoted over 100,000 man-hours to this work, which they gave unselfishly and without thought of personal gain.

The themes selected for the posters are based on the President's first war message on the state of the Union, made to Congress on January 6, 1942. They deal effectively with important issues on the home front, such as Production, War Bonds, The Nature of the Enemy, Loose Talk, Deliver Us From Evil, Slave World or Free World, The People Are on the March, and Sacrifice.

The program of Artists for Victory includes distribution and dissemination of these vital messages in the widest possible ways. Its object is also to assist the Federal, State, and local governments in the prosecution of the war and, to that end, it commits the entire artistic profession to the united will to victory. Artists for Victory embraces the fields of the graphic arts, painting, sculpture, mural painting, architecture, landscape architecture, decoration, and all the kindred arts and crafts. On the Board are Hobart Nichols, president of the National Academy of Design, who is president of Artists for Victory, Inc.; John Taylor Arms, etcher; A. F. Brinkerhoff, landscape architect; Arthur Crisp and Hugo Gellert, mural painters; Irwin D. Hoffman, painter and etcher; Julian Clarence Levi, architect; Paul Manship, sculptor; and J. Scott Williams, painter, as well as other distinguished men of art.

Under these auspices and with the cooperation of numerous Government agencies and private industry, the results obtained are placing Artists for Victory in a position of growing responsibility in relation to the war.

With support from private industry, Artists for Victory was able to set up the national war poster competition, to mobilize the artists of the country for the purpose of obtaining inspirational fighting posters on the vital issues of the war. The artists who participated in the competitions were not motivated by any prize considerations but responded spontaneously out of a deep desire to help our country in this perilous period. Up to now, 18 posters have been reproduced, 13 of which are being used by Government agencies such as Office of War Information, War Production Board, the Treasury Department, and the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Additional posters were issued by

R. Hoe & Co., of New York, who also underwrote the expenses of the war poster competition and awarded prizes to four artists aggregating \$1,200. The Council for Democracy, of New York, offered four more prizes, and the I. B. M. Corporation another prize—a total of \$2,700 in awards. Copies of these posters are being distributed and shown in many places throughout the country.

President Roosevelt has lauded the patriotic spirit that dominated the efforts of Artists for Victory, Inc., and its artists, in a letter addressed to the president of the organization, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 16, 1942.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: I have seen the report by Artists for Victory on its national war-poster competition. It is proof of what can be done by groups whose ordinary occupations might seem far removed from war. More than 2,000 war posters were produced by the artists of the country, not as a chore they were asked to do but as a voluntary, spontaneous contribution to the war. The very name of your organization is symbolic of the determination of every man and woman in every activity of life throughout the Nation to enlist in the cause to which our country is dedicated.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

It is gratifying for me to note that letters expressing enthusiastic interest in this patriotic exhibition have been received from many Senators and Congressmen by Artists for Victory, among whom are Senators JOHN H. BANKHEAD, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, GEORGE D. AIKEN, WARREN AUSTIN, JAMES M. MEAD, HARRY S. TRUMAN, Congressmen J. HARDIN PETERSON, JAMES P. McGRANERY, JOHN SPARKMAN, and many others.

The program of Artists for Victory is national in scope. Fully 100,000,000 impressions of the war posters have already appeared in magazines, newspapers, and periodicals—such as Life, the New York Times, trade, and art publications, etc. The United States Treasury Department is sponsoring a traveling exhibit of the posters which were shown at the National Gallery. This exhibit will be sent on tour to key cities throughout the country. Through this exhibit local War bond committees can dramatize the sale of War bonds and stamps.

The program of industrial cooperation is being continued through the printing in full color of 50 selected posters from the competition as war-poster labels available in perforated sheets. These labels will, it is expected, reach almost every man, woman, and child in the country with their powerful patriotic messages concerning the issues of the war. In this effort Artists for Victory has secured the cooperation of the Ever-Ready Label Corporation, of New York, which will print and distribute 5,000,000 of these war labels immediately. Artists for Victory expect that over a billion copies of these labels will be distributed throughout the country—through banks, retail stores, war-industry plants, schools, and many patriotic committees and organizations.

All sections, all factions, and all creeds are thus being welded together in a full awareness of the dangers that threaten the American way of life. The wide distribution of these war labels will, in addition, keep our people aware of the ideals for which we entered the war—ideals which might otherwise be forgotten in the stress of the struggle.

Artists for Victory is making valuable contributions to the country's war effort, and it contemplates as full a participation in the solution of the cultural and social problems of the peace.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on November 13 last a bill was approved amending the Selective Service Act. That bill contained the so-called Tydings amendment. A few days ago the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] introduced a bill in which he was joined by 36 other Senators to amend the Tydings amendment. The Bankhead bill was referred to the Senate Military Affairs Committee. There was a close division in the committee for and against the Bankhead bill as presented. The bill was amended in the Military Affairs Committee by the Wilson amendment, presented by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and was reported by a 9-to-7 vote. The minority presented a report which was prepared by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and offered another amendment in the form of a substitute for the Bankhead bill as amended.

After this bill was placed on the calendar the members of the Military Affairs Committee, and others who were interested in the Bankhead bill, met with Senators who favored other versions, and worked out a second substitute. Today that amendment was offered by me as a substitute for the pending bill. As Senators will recall, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] then offered a second amendment, in the form of a substitute for the substitute which I had previously offered. That is the parliamentary situation before the Senate at the present time.

The difference between the so-called O'Mahoney amendment and the last form of the Bankhead amendment is not very great. The O'Mahoney amendment proposes to amend the portion of the act known as the Tydings amendment by affixing thereto an appendix. It would not change the language of the Tydings amendment at all. It would merely add a provision at the end of the Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment contains certain language which is objectionable because of the experience we have had with the operation of the act since the 13th of November. The objectionable language to which I have reference is as follows:

Every registrant found by a selective-service local board—

And so forth—

shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as—

This is the language which in my opinion is not satisfactory—

satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That language sounds all right; in theory perhaps it is all right, but in actual practice it does not work satisfactorily. In the first place, to whom shall the replacement be satisfactory? Shall it be the selective-service board, or the

applicant for deferment? What is to be the nature of the satisfaction? A man on a farm might ask for deferment because his services were required in the production of farm commodities, and the board could say:

No; we cannot defer you yet, but we will see. If we can find a satisfactory replacement for you, then, of course, we will not defer you.

The board could then send out to that farm some young person—perhaps a woman or some inexperienced farmer—and say, "That is a satisfactory replacement," while, of course, it would not be satisfactory to the farmer in any sense of the word. Therefore, that language is important and, in my opinion, very objectionable. It is retained in the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment.

I wish to point out another difference between the O'Mahoney amendment and the pending amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to try to define the O'Mahoney proposal a little more clearly, perhaps, than the Senator has done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no doubt the distinguished Senator from Maryland can do so, but I should like to point out the other difference, and then I will yield to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall do as the Senator suggests. I am not taking issue with anything he has said about the O'Mahoney proposal, but I believe that under the regulations of the Selective Service System, pursuant to the so-called Tydings amendment, it must appear, after consultation between the agricultural manpower officials and other officials, that the agricultural worker produces so many units a month of essential agricultural products. Essential agricultural employment is defined. What the O'Mahoney amendment does—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was coming to that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The second difference between the so-called O'Mahoney amendment and the Bankhead amendment is with respect to the standards to which the Senator from Maryland has referred. The Bankhead amendment does not contain those standards. It provides for a formula. Something is multiplied by something else, and the result is divided by some other factor to find out whether or not a man is to be deferred. The formula is complicated and not practical in its application. The Bankhead amendment would endeavor to accomplish the same result by a different method. The Bank-

head amendment has a limitation substantially as follows:

Substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164—

Instead of the complicated and difficult formula to which I have made reference, and which was worked out by the "brain trust" in the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service Division, we have a sensible application in this amendment which any board can understand:

Substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164—

and listed in a certain list prepared by the Department of Agriculture. That is the difference between the two amendments in those particulars. Otherwise they are similar in their effect and purpose. Both of them are mandatory in their provisions and direct the Selective Service Board to make certain deferments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the word "substantial" mean?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Michigan is an expert on words. If there is such an expert in the Senate, it is the Senator from Michigan. I would not attempt to define for the Senator from Michigan what "substantially" means.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Tydings amendment fell down because its language was susceptible of wide latitude in interpretation, it seems to me that the word "substantially" is likely to fall down for the same reason.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think it is quite so wide open as the language contained in the act. The wording occurs in the O'Mahoney amendment and also in the Bankhead amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it not true that the question of what is "substantially full time" will have to be decided by the draft board, and that the very defect contained in the Tydings amendment will be written in bold English words into the substitute now pending?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think it will take much judgment on the part of anyone to determine whether a worker is employed substantially full time. At least the mathematical formula which has been applied by the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service System will not be required to determine the matter.

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese struck at us in a most dastardly manner and involved us in two great wars. Up to that time most pantry shelves were full of supplies of all kinds. The small merchant had an ample stock of goods on his shelves and in his warehouse. The wholesaler was likewise stocked with nec-

essities. The packers had their storage space full of beef and meats of all kinds. The elevators, mills, warehouses, and storage places throughout the country were filled to overflowing with agricultural commodities. In fact, they were so full that they were a burden upon the storage facilities. Then came December 7, 1941.

Let us see what the situation is today. There is hardly a pantry in the country which is not empty. There is hardly a grocery store anywhere which does not have bare shelves.

There is hardly a meat case in any retail establishment which is not devoid of meats of all kinds. The packers are short of meat. They cannot supply the demand. The agricultural surpluses which were so burdensome a few months ago seem to be disappearing very rapidly. The other day the Department of Agriculture stopped the sale of wheat below parity price for livestock feed, which indicates that we do not have the huge surpluses we once thought we had.

What do we find the situation to be in the rest of the world? We find the people of China starving. We find the people of Russia living mostly on dark bread. In Poland, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, little children are starving for lack of food. In Spain a serious situation exists. In France conditions are even worse. According to reports received from our soldiers, conditions in north Africa are deplorable. The other day I received a letter from a soldier stating that Arabs sat around the camps of American soldiers with their legs crossed, waiting like buzzards for some one to give them a morsel of food, and that they made raids on the garbage cans of the American soldiers. Famine everywhere throughout the world, except in North America. Unless something is done, very shortly we also shall experience famine. That is the inspiration, the cause, the objective, and the purpose back of the pending bill.

Some say, "Well, let us see what the Army has to say about this." Mr. President, this matter is one which does not concern the Army. The bill has nothing whatever to do with the size of the Army. It simply has to do with the production of agricultural commodities. It is not the business of the Army. The Army has a very important business. That business is to fight the two most difficult wars America has ever waged. It is not up to the Army to produce the needed food. That task is up to the American people; and it is up to the Congress of the United States so to handle the situation that the farmers of the country may produce the food. That is not the Army's job. It is our job. The place where action must be taken is right here in the Senate, and the time is right now, this very day. In a few days it will be time for planting; in fact, in many sections of the country it is already time for planting.

One difficulty arises from the fact that there is a certain glamour about being a soldier, and there is a certain feeling of obligation on the part of all the citizens

to serve in the armed forces. That feeling is not peculiar to any one group of our people or to any people of any particular employment. The farmers have that urge the same as do the men who live in the city; and the farmers feel that they have a duty to perform in the service of their country. However, I desire to say that at the present time, under all the present circumstances, the successful farmer who has his farm organized and is producing sizable quantities of food, producing meat of all kinds, and grain of all kinds, is just as necessary, if not more necessary, to the war effort than is any general we have in the Army at the present time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with interest to what the Senator has said and have obtained a great deal of light from his remarks. I was wondering how the bill would change the situation in relation to farm help, in view of the fact that on the 6th of this month Mr. McNutt issued a directive. What would be the difference in effect upon the farm help of the country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The difference in effect, I think, would be considerable. The difference in the correct approach today is important, as well. The Congress, not Mr. McNutt, should lay down the laws, so far as that is concerned; but, as a matter of fact, the directive worked out between the Department of Agriculture and Mr. McNutt on the 6th day of March should have been worked out under the Tydings amendment on the 13th day of November. They neglected to issue that directive to the selective service boards. They waited all those months without issuing it. I am of the opinion that the only reason they finally issued it on the 6th day of March is the Bankhead bill, which came from the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, let me point out to the Senator that the directive also continues the provisions of the Tydings amendment for farm units and for provision of replacements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. I was going to mention that in further answer to the Senator from Wisconsin. The directive which has been issued still has the difficult formula of dividing and multiplying in finding an answer for all the selective service boards before a farmer can be deferred. But under the Bankhead amendment it is mandatory that farm workers, if they are engaged in the production of agricultural commodities essential to the war effort, be deferred. They cannot even be taken into the Army if they volunteer.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The other day I listened to a radio commentator who described the situation. I wonder whether this particular bill would provide any relief.

I refer particularly to the fact that, apparently, different cities and different counties are called upon for quotas which have been arrived at by means of some method of mathematical computation. The result is that in many States and in many cities there are still young men between the ages of 18 and 38 years who have not been taken into the service because in those places there is a larger percentage of single men of such ages than there is in places where men in the married group have been taken. On the other hand, in other States and in other cities the selective service boards now are drawing on the group of married men who have dependent children.

A few days ago I received a telegram from my own county, stating that a whole contingent of farmers was leaving from Milwaukee to go into the service. I wonder whether there is any provision that when the number of men counties and States are supposed to furnish under a certain call is apportioned, consideration shall be given to whether in those areas the group of available single men is already exhausted, and that, if so, the area should not be called upon to furnish married men under a quota until the number of available single men in other areas is exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course the Senator brings up the difficulty under the Tydings amendment. However, before we leave the question originally propounded to me as to the difference between the legislative act and procedure and the directive or the document issued by Mr. McNutt, let me say that the directive which has been issued can be changed tomorrow, whereas if we make provision by law it will be on the statute books and will not be changed until we get ready to change it. That, I think, is a very, very important difference.

Now, returning to the Senator's question as to quotas, let me say that of course he has pointed out what has broken down the Tydings amendment and operations under it. The Tydings amendment is before the draft boards. Then the State is called upon to fill a certain quota; but the boards are down at the bottom of the barrel so far as single men are concerned, and they have to select married men. They have to fill their quotas. They have to take married men. They see a farm boy out in the country, and they say, "Well, we should get that rosy-cheeked fellow. He will make a good soldier." So they put him in class I-A. That is exactly what has happened. That is exactly what has happened in my State; and, as the Senator has stated, that is exactly what is happening right now in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator comment on this point for me: My situation, as the Senator has outlined, is that I have a basic prejudice against occupational deferment by class. I think legislation to that effect in respect to the selective service is bad legislation.

I think selective service ceases to be such when there is general occupational deferment.

On the other hand, I recognize the complete truth of everything the Senator says about the necessity of conserving an adequate farm-labor supply. As a result of all the inquiries which have been made, will the Senator say to me that there is no way effectively to protect indispensable farm labor under the theory by which we tried to proceed via the Tydings amendment, except by general occupational deferment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In my opinion, it could have been worked out by the Selective Service System; but they did not do it. They could have worked it out under the Tydings amendment, but they failed to do so—they miserably failed. As evidence of that fact, I call attention again to the administrative directive which was issued on March 6, which must condemn them. Why was it not issued on November 13?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely agree with the Senator; but I ask him again—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The real answer, of course, to the Senator's question—

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I should like to have—the real answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The real answer is that the crisis is so severe that we must have blanket deferment; that is, we must keep on the farm every boy who is on the farm. Senators can call it blanket deferment if they want to do so. The workers must be kept on the farms, and we must get more help on the farms.

A few days ago Secretary Wickard, in testifying before one of our committees, said:

Since I appeared before you a month ago, I have become increasingly alarmed about our inability to get enough farm labor to reach the goals that we have established for farm production this year. I am more alarmed today than I was yesterday—

And so on. The Secretary of Agriculture is alarmed, and so am I alarmed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So am I; and I agree with what the Senator says; and I agree with Secretary Wickard's conclusion about the situation. I agree that the directive of March 6 has been insufficiently delayed.

Then I come back to the question, Is it not possible to implement the Tydings amendment by legislation in the fashion of a directive, so that we may reach the problem directly without a general blanket deferment? That is my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what we want to do. We want to try to implement the Tydings amendment so that it will be effective. The only way we can implement it so that it will be effective is to make it mandatory. If we leave it optional, the same conditions will continue which have prevailed during the past many months.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Tydings amendment is changed in the fashion the Senator recommends there is no necessity that the deferred draftee shall be indispensable to the farm. All he has to

do is to work on it. As a result, it seems to me that anybody who wants to avoid the draft can get a job on a farm, whether he is indispensable or not in respect to the particular farm operation. It seems to me that a test finally has got to be applied to determine the indispensability of the individual who finds himself on a particular farm where he works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the Senator read the so-called Bankhead amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I have been listening to the Senator's explanation of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to read it, for I think it states the case in strong language. It says:

(k) Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort shall, while he continues to be so engaged or employed, be deferred by his selective service local board from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The commodity has to be indispensable, but the worker does not have to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The commodity has to be indispensable, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But the worker does not have to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The amendment does not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It says he has to be producing an indispensable commodity, and if he is not producing such a commodity he is not indispensable, and he is not deferred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator willing to have the bill read that the worker must not only be "engaged substantially full time," but that he must be indispensable?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to know who would determine the question of indispensability.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The same person who will determine whether the worker is engaged substantially full time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no; the question is to be determined by certain facts, such as, Is the worker substantially making his living by the production of certain foods, certain commodities?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose a farmer has 10 workers when he needs only 5; the proposal would defer all of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not going to suppose for a moment that farmers would be so asinine. They do not do business in that way. I think we have to have a little faith in the farmers of this country and concede that they will play fair, and at least will not hire more men than they need. I know industry does that when they get cost-plus contracts which are charged to the Treasury of the United States; but the farmer does not have that privilege; he cannot reach into the Treasury of the United States and do that. If he

hires labor, he has to pay for it out of his own pocket, and he does not hire a single man more than he needs at any time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is undoubtedly so, but the Senator can see what I am trying to get at. I may have used an unfortunate illustration. Let me use the illustration of a man in town who, when his draft number is up, wants to do anything he can in order to avoid service under the draft; all he has to do is to get a job on the farm, and he is safe under the language of the proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would have to remain on the farm.

Mr. VANDENBERG. For how long?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Whenever he quit the job on the farm he would have to go to his draft board and report. What we want him to do is to stay on the farm and "hit the ball."

Mr. VANDENBERG. All he has to do is to remain on the farm and he is exempt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He has to work at the production of essential commodities; that is all he has to do. In that sense he does not have to go into the draft; but we have to have men on the farms.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question which was addressed to the Senator from Colorado by the Senator from Michigan pointed directly at the divergence between the amendment now offered by the Senator from Colorado and the amendment which is recommended by the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs. That amendment takes careful consideration of the individual contribution of each individual registrant to the production of an essential commodity. It makes the difference between a broad occupational deferment to which the Senator objects, and a deferment, which is based upon the individual contribution of each individual registrant to the production of an essential agricultural commodity. When that condition exists under the amendment proposed by the minority the local selective-service board has no discretion except to grant deferment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why would not that achieve the same purpose as a general occupational deferment? I should like to hear what the Senator from Colorado has to say about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The rule we have applied to agriculture is a rule which has been applied to industry. We have done nothing other than to apply a rule which has been in effect right along insofar as industry is concerned.

In regard to the contention of the Senator from Wyoming, that he has a better formula for determining whether or not a man is doing something worth while on the farm, let me point out that our amendment reads—

Shall be engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the

production of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164 of the Selective Service System as being a commodity essential to the war effort.

That is the way we state it—"substantially full time."

I shall state the way the formula of the Senator from Wyoming works out. It is a complicated, confused, mathematical formula, the production of the "brain trust."

WAR UNIT

A war unit is a measure of production of essential farm products. In the attached table essential farm products are given a relative value in terms of war units. The following, for example, are each equivalent to one war unit: 1 milk cow, 20 feed lot cattle, 1 acre in beets, 5 acres in dry beans, 20 acres in wheat, 1 acre in carrots, and so forth.

CONVERSION FACTOR

The conversion factor is the percentage that a given product, whether it be a single animal or a single acre of special type production, bears to a war unit, for example: 1 acre of wheat is 0.05 of a war unit; 1 acre of onions is 1.00 of a war unit; 1 acre of strawberries is 1.50 of a war unit, and so forth.

The number of acres given to a certain type of production or the number of animals of a specified type multiplied by the conversion factor results in the war unit value, for example: 3 range cattle multiplied by the conversion factor of 0.07 results in a 0.21 war unit; 19 acres of Irish potatoes multiplied by the conversion factor of 0.50 is equivalent to 9.50 war units, and so forth.

There is the difference between the O'Mahoney approach and the Bankhead approach. The Senator from Alabama says "substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production of food that is needed in the war effort." The O'Mahoney amendment goes back to the unit rule. It is a difficult formula, and I suppose when the farmer reads it he will say, "I had rather go into the Army than try to figure out this provision."

Mr. TAFT and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio, who was on his feet first.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask a question as to the application of this to a farmer who is married and deferred because of dependency. Does the second part of the amendment apply to him so that a man would be prevented from going into a war industry, we will say, or does he still retain deferment by reason of dependency over and above any deferment given him by this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He may have two cars. I do not know whether he has or not. Not being a lawyer I cannot very well answer that. At least, however, this is the situation.

Mr. TAFT. The bill says every registrant engaged in farming shall be deferred.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well. A farmer who is married is deferred under this bill so long as he remains on the farm and produces certain agricultural commodities. If he decides that he wants to change his occupation and go to the city and get a job, he can go to his local selective board and pre-

sent the matter to them. They will render final judgment whether he is more valuable on the farm than he would be working in a war industry in town.

Mr. TAFT. That is what I do not understand. I do not think the bill is clear as to whether a man who is married and deferred on the ground of dependency is covered by this bill or is not covered by it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He is covered by it. Of course, every farmer, every registrant, is covered by it; it is all-inclusive. Whether a farmer has two children and a wife would not make a particle of difference.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator say that the intention of the bill is to treat a man who is deferred for dependency just as if he were a single man so far as saying to him, "You can stay on the farm or go into the Army" is concerned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as this bill is concerned, that is true. The question is not exactly as the Senator states it, "stay on the farm or go into the Army." He has another opportunity; he can go to town and go into industry, if the board approves such a change.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I was about to say that it seems to me that under the O'Mahoney amendment the farmer has to come to Washington and get a clearance from the Department of Agriculture, as I understand the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Colorado will say that that is not the case.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true if I read it correctly. It provides:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time certify to the Selective Service System—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is in the substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This is the language for which the Senator is looking. It is on the second page of the O'Mahoney amendment:

If the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard of production per person as set forth in such release No. 164.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the formula I have just read. So the O'Mahoney amendment ties the farm worker to that unit rule, and that is the objection some of us had to the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we might as well realize that the bill deals primarily with married men. The farms of the country have been nearly stripped of the single men, and if we took every last single man left on the farms between the ages of 18 and 38, we would not get over 250,000. Those are the figures which applied a

month ago, and the number is probably considerably less than that today. So the bill deals primarily with married men on the farm. There are about 2,600,000 married men between the ages of 18 and 38 on the farms, and probably between a million and a quarter and a million and a half of them would be physically qualified for duty in the armed services. So when we consider this matter, I think we should consider that we are concerned primarily with men who have been classed in 3-A for family reasons.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Vermont, and I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that we are about down to the bottom of the barrel in all categories, so far as single men in the United States are concerned. Therefore, if this bill did not deal with the married men, it would be worthless, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I felt, at the time of the adoption of the Tydings amendment, and I have felt more strongly ever since, that, though it probably was the best we could do at the time, one of its defects in fixing 6 months as the maximum deferment for a man engaged in essential agriculture was that the 6 months might terminate in the midst of a harvest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was taken out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was thinking of it as it was first offered. But aside from that, my theory has been—and I have not been thoroughly convinced that I am wrong about it—that probably it was not started in time. If the local boards had been given full authority from the beginning to determine whether a man should be left on the farm or should be drafted, it would have been better than our belated effort now to correct the situation, because all the draft boards, in all the counties, are patriotic men, they are level-headed men, and they are doing a good job under the law and under the instructions which they have received from the selective service authorities in Washington. They know the men in their localities or, if they do not know them, they can find out all about them. They have facilities for learning whether the work of these men is essential, whether they should be deferred indefinitely, or for a period which they might themselves fix.

Many young farm hands have already gone into the Army. I would hesitate a long time, under the present circumstances, to vote for any bill which would take them out of the Army and put them back on the farms, although I understand that is being advocated. I am somewhat in sympathy with the attitude of the Senator from Michigan toward wholesale occupational deferment. I doubt the wisdom of saying by law that any class of citizens of this country shall be relieved from military service, because the war we are in is a war in which we are all engaged, it affects all of us, and to the extent necessary for all classes to render service, I think it is in the interest

of the country, and it is certainly in compliance with our theories of democracy and universal service, that that should be the rule.

I am wondering now whether we should enact the proposed legislation, and provide that all those now on the farm shall stay there, or that any others who are not on the farm but who go there before they are inducted into the service shall remain there, provided they are engaged in agriculture substantially for full time, leaving it up to the board.

In thinking about it, in connection with the farmers whose helpers have already gone into the Army, I wonder how they are going to feel about this freezing of other farm hands on the farm, when theirs have not been frozen on the farm but are frozen in the Army, insofar as that may be possible.

I am a little in doubt about the wisdom of the proposal. I am on the fence about it. I told the Senator from Alabama this morning that I thought his bill was half wrong and half right. There are certain features of it about which I cannot enthuse, yet I realize the necessity of conserving farm labor as much as we can. Can the Senator from Colorado relieve my mind of some of the difficulties which I face?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the first place, of course, the bill does not do anything about the man already in the Army. As the Senator from Kentucky has already stated, he is frozen in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the bill does not deal with those men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is unfortunate that the bill was not enacted before December 7, 1941, but few of us thought that the farm crisis would develop the way it has developed. We did not have sufficient foresight; our hindsight is much better. Now we find ourselves in a very difficult situation. We find famine facing us on every hand. We find famine all over the world. We know that we will be facing famine here in the United States. We are attempting to be the breadbasket for the world, and we know the world needs some country to be its breadbasket, and to take care of its breadbasket for it. We have that additional problem facing us, and this crisis has developed.

Simply because we were wrong in the first place, shall we say we are going to continue wrong to the bitter end, that we are not going to make any change simply because of the inequities between the boy who was drafted before the bill was enacted and the boy who was drafted afterward?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say "No" to that question. Of course, we all have been compelled, in view of the novelty of the situation and the circumstances which we have faced, to grope more or less in the dark in seeking to solve many of these problems. In addition to that, sometimes we have not had the courage even to go in where the light of experience and wisdom would have directed us to go, because we are tender-footed and cautious, and we are not always sure what the reaction on the morale of the people will be in a given situation. We cannot ignore all that. I am not speak-

ing of political fear or caution, or the desire to walk on eggshells so as not to break any of them. I am talking about really following the lamp of experience in trying to devise wise laws which cannot be interpreted as a species of class legislation beyond absolute necessity in a war in which all classes and all citizens, regardless of politics, religion, color, or condition, are interested in the result. I want us to follow, as far as we can, the ideals of a democratic nation, in preserving what we are trying to preserve of democracy and equality.

Frankly, I am somewhat bothered about both the bill as offered and the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. I mean that I cannot be sure of myself in voting for either of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very certain that had such a bill as this been proposed to the Senate a year ago, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated. At that time we did not realize what the food situation would be. There was no way by which we could foretell it. As I have said, our pantry shelves were full, our stores were loaded down with food, our warehouses and storage places were filled, and we never thought we would be facing famine so soon; but we are.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator about that. I see that famine is predicted, and all that, but I am wondering how close to famine we really are, as a matter of fact. I know it is always desirable, when we want the whole people to do something, probably to overestimate the necessity, so that they will come up promptly to what they should do.

Speaking of meat, I was told by the Secretary of Agriculture not more than a week ago that, while many dairy cows have been slaughtered because of the economic situation of the dairy industry, there are 500,000 more beef cattle in this country today than there were a year ago. If that is true that would not indicate a famine in meat. I realize that the Army eats more meat and more solid, substantial food than the same number of men would eat at home. A different kind of food is required for the men in the Army. Of course, we cannot neglect them in any regard. Then, too, we have sent food to our allies; but the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago was that our shipments amounted to only about 6 percent of our total production. The increased consumption of the Army and the Navy, and the increased shipments abroad, which are somewhat offset by reason of lack of shipping, or because commerce has been interfered with, result in a total percentage of increase in consumption which on the surface does not present an alarming figure. It may be that in some other commodities, of which there is not a surplus, or of which there may be a shortage, such a situation exists, but in the heavier, more substantial meat products, unless I either misunderstood the Secretary of Agriculture, or he was mistaken—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, the Senator from Kentucky did not mis-

understand the Secretary. The Secretary's statement is correct, according to all the statistics, but the Secretary has also stated that this year, 1943, we need a 5 percent greater production than we had in 1942, and 1942 was the greatest farm food production year this country has ever had. I presume that is so, generally speaking.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that 5 percent greater production an over-all 5 percent, over everything?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, that is an over-all 5 percent increase of everything which the Secretary said we must have.

Recurring to the meat situation, I do not think there is any doubt at all that we have more cattle in this country today than we have ever had.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I shall be glad to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The number of cattle, as has been pointed out, is not the decisive factor. The weight of the cattle is the decisive factor. The Secretary has stated in recent days that there is a shortage of protein feed for the cattle, and that the estimate is that the cattle crop—if it may be so termed—now in existence in bulk for slaughter will be less in weight by several hundred million pounds than it was last year, notwithstanding the increased need. The Secretary also pointed out that the protein feeds the cattle had been feeding on are less because the people, by reason of scarcity of other foods, are eating much of the protein food which it was intended should be consumed by cattle.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know, of course, that it takes more protein feed to feed cattle until they are 2 years old than it does to feed them until they are 1 year old, and then sell them. At the same time more meat is obtained from 2-year-old cattle than from 1-year-old cattle.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But if we follow the statement of the Secretary with respect to the number of cattle we must also follow his statement with respect to the weight of the cattle. He said that, notwithstanding the number of cattle, it is inevitable that there will be a very large meat reduction because of the reduction in the weight of the cattle.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might be contributed to by two situations. One is that we have killed the cattle at a younger age when they have a lesser weight. Another is that we have run short of the type of feed necessary to produce the extra weight in cattle.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky, I cannot speak for any other State than my own, but I am familiar with conditions in my State. I have been speaking in the Senate about this very manpower problem for over a year. I

pointed out more than a year ago on this floor exactly the situation which was developing, which has culminated in the present very dangerous and tragic situation. I have received letters by the hundreds from Missouri. A man wrote me and said:

I have been in the habit of feeding 100, 200, sometimes 300 cattle. I have been feeding cattle for a great many years. I am 68 years old. My two boys have been drafted. I cannot obtain any farm labor. The farm labor has gone to the munitions plants. I cannot run my place and feed my cattle. I am going to sell off my cattle and put in a truck garden to support myself and the old woman until this thing is over and the boys come home.

The result is that while there may have been some increase in the actual number of cattle, the farmers are selling their feed upon which the beef cattle of the United States were always dependent, instead of feeding it to the cattle.

Mr. President, this is a situation which should have been perceived a year or a year and a half ago. Some of us have been talking about it on the floor of the Senate that long. I have had this matter up repeatedly with the Department of Agriculture and the Selective Service Administration, pointing out that exactly this situation was going to develop, but we have been pushed away.

Since I am on my feet I wish to say that I doubt very much that any of the proposed measures are going to do any more than lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen, because many farms have gone out of production. The young men working on the farms are in the Army. I think, instead of this being a legislative matter, it should have been an administrative matter, because it is very difficult to legislate with all the contingencies in mind. It is much more difficult to handle it as a matter of legislation than it would have been to handle it as a matter of administration.

The whole situation, from the point of view of selective service, of manpower, and the Department of Agriculture, has, in my opinion, resulted in the most tragic failure this country has ever known. I do not know anything the Congress can do to correct it, except to pass legislation on the subject, halting and clumsy and doubtful as the legislation may be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask another question of the Senator from Colorado. I do not wish to take too much of his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am always glad to be interrupted by the Senator from Kentucky. I thank the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for his contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill and also the substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] propose to leave it to the local boards to determine, first, whether any given draftee or registrant is engaged, especially in agriculture, substantially at full time. That is awkward language, but that is what it means. Then also they are to determine whether he can go to a munitions factory, or to any other industry outside agriculture. Sup-

pose that a man at any given time is working on a farm, and is certified as being essentially and substantially on full time engaged in agriculture. He would be deferred. Suppose later on he decides that he wants to quit farming and go into an industry, where many farmers have gone. I have been told that for every man the Army has taken from the farm, industry has taken anywhere from three to five. I think three to one is a conservative estimate, and probably it is four to one.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that it probably is three to seven.

Mr. BARKLEY. Three to seven? The Senator means seven to three.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Seven to industry and three to farming.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a little more than two to one. Of course, they have already gone, hundreds of thousands of them, and they are working, and probably would be certified, if the board had any such power, as being engaged in an essential industry, to wit, turning out munitions of one kind or another. Suppose any given man who now is deferred by the local board on the ground that his whole time, or substantially all his time, is taken up in agriculture wants to go to a munitions factory, and applies to the board, and the board turns him down. Let us assume he decides he can get around that situation by simply quitting farming altogether, so that he could not any longer be certified as being engaged in an essential agricultural industry. There is no way of making him work on the farm if he does not want to. In that situation what would this bill do?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He would lose his deferment, and he would be classified I-A.

Mr. BARKLEY. But suppose the board then were authorized, or suppose it exercised the authority, to determine whether he should go to the Army or go to some industrial plant where he could get a job.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The board can do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The board can do that in either case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the board can do that in either case. It can determine whether he shall go in the Army or into industry. He may decide whether he will stay on the farm, but the board decides whether he shall go into the Army or into industry. It can determine the question either way.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to a matter in regard to shortage of food which perhaps he has not thought about. The fundamental difference between the United States forces and Hitler, for instance, lies in the way they handle captured or occupied countries. Whenever Hitler captures a country he steals all the food the country has. He takes it right away from the people. He robs them of food and of everything else. When the United States forces capture enemy-occupied territory they feed the people. We not only let them have what they

previously possessed but we bring in other supplies for them.

We expect to take considerable territory during the next months, and undoubtedly will, and as we take territory we must step in and feed the citizens of the countries we occupy. We want to do it and we will do it. It will require immense quantities of food.

Then, in regard to the beef, the people of the country have more money now than ever before. There is practically no unemployment in this country. Workers have money to buy beef. They do not use substitutes for beef. They take the real thing. Our Army is using an immense quantity of beef, and we are trying to get some for lend-lease purposes. As a result, even though we are in a statistically good position, so far as cattle are concerned, we are in a bad situation because of the great demand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I glanced over the Secretary's testimony in which he details the agricultural situation in somewhat pessimistic terms, but I do not find where he advocates this bill. What would the Senator say with respect to his position on the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know that he was asked about this particular bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will say that naturally the Secretary did not want to make any statement in direct conflict with the attitude of the President or the administration, but the Secretary said that no more men should be taken from the farms.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I saw that statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He agrees to the principle of the bill, whether he approves it in this form or not. He gives warning that this situation is growing worse all the time; that we cannot hope to have as much production as we had last year, not only because of the shortage of labor but because of the shortage of farm implements and the fact that the best workers, the young men on the farm, have gone and the replacements are not equal to the ones who have gone. He points out that we cannot get as much production per man this year as we had last year. With all these factors he positively asserts that no more men should be taken from the farms this year.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, my sentiments are somewhat the same as those expressed by our able leader [Mr. BARKLEY]. I have just returned from my State, and I know there is a very severe and acute shortage of labor. The State is engaged primarily in the production of food.

It seems to me that in considering legislation of the nature proposed three principles should be apparent. The first is that the country should be dealt with fairly, because the military forces have their imperative needs.

The second is that the legislation should be fair as between man and man in regard to the duty to perform military service.

The third is that it must be fair to agriculture, upon which such imperative demands are being made at the present time.

Leaving out the first principle, I am afraid that the proposed legislation does not deal fairly as between man and man in respect to their several obligations to perform military service. As the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said, if a man went from the city to the farm and obtained a job he would be exempt by virtue of the proposed legislation. As I understand, all that the bill or the O'Mahoney amendment does is to require that a man be engaged substantially in the performance of farm work. That does not mean that he must be diligent, or do a good job, or necessarily be faithful in the performance of his work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield? I must interrupt the Senator from Florida at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The characterization which has been employed by the distinguished Senator from Florida does not apply to the minority amendment. I think that should be clear.

That is the substantial difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the one offered by the minority. The minority amendment would require a minimum of individual contribution. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would not.

Mr. PEPPER. I have the language of the O'Mahoney amendment before me. It reads as follows:

That for the purposes of this subsection, a registrant shall be found by his selective-service local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort (1) if he is engaged substantially full time in the production of agricultural commodities certified to the Selective Service System by the Secretary of Agriculture as being essential to the war effort and set forth in local board release No. 164, effective January 16, 1943, and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That makes it individual contribution.

Mr. PEPPER. Indeed, it does not, if I read it correctly. Let me finish the clause—

and (2) if the production of such commodities attributable to such registrant is at least equal to the minimum standard production per person as set forth in such release No. 164.

Does the Senator believe that that requires the individual worker to turn out a certain amount of work a day, a week, or a month?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely; it requires the production of the minimum individual contribution set forth in release No. 164, and because it does, certain Members of the Senate object to it. They want to eliminate the second qualification.

Mr. PEPPER. Does that apply to the number of cows a farmer has to milk, the number of hands he shall use in milking, and matters of that nature? Are they laid down in the circular?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The proper standard is laid down.

Mr. PEPPER. Assuming that I am in error about that, the other question is whether or not these criteria would exempt a man who should be exempt to carry on the farm operation. What is the standard to be applied to an individual worker on the farm to determine whether or not the farm could get along without him? Would the Senator say that there may not be cases in which a worker could be spared, and that in every case on every farm every man not yet drafted should be deferred?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been a farmer all my life, and I have never hired a man for 1 minute whom I did not need. I believe the answer to the question of the Senator from Florida will have to be left to the judgment of the farmer. As I have already stated, the farmer is not operating on a cost-plus basis.

Mr. PEPPER. If I correctly understand, it is not left to the judgment of the farmer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If a farm laborer is working for a farmer, so long as the laborer remains on the farm and works for the farmer, he is deferred.

Mr. PEPPER. Regardless of whether the farmer can get along without him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The farmer can determine whether he can get along without the man.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand the language of the bill which the able Senator is now sponsoring, it contemplates a blanket deferment, and a man could not be taken away from the farm unless he requested his selective service board to allow him to go somewhere else. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that is not entirely correct. A man must be making his living off the farm and must be engaged in the production of certain specified farm commodities.

Mr. PEPPER. I invite the Senator's attention to the following language:

Until January 1, 1944, every registrant—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not the amendment that is before us at the present time. A substitute has been offered for that amendment, and we are now discussing the latest Bankhead amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The language in italics in Senate bill 729 is not now before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator kindly refer to the language and indicate the standard with respect to the need of the individual person on the farm?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will read the language:

Every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm in connection with the production or harvesting of any agricultural commodity set forth in local board release No. 164—

That release lists all the essential farm commodities important to the war industry, and nothing else.

Mr. PEPPER. So it is not required that the particular person be found by a disinterested agency to be essential to the operation of the farm. There are many sons of farmers throughout the country who have no more right to be deferred than have the sons of other farmers who have gone to war. If a farmer can obtain another man to take the place of his son, or if the father is not sick and can carry on the farm operation, why should the Congress, without giving anyone any discretion to pass upon a particular case, say that the boy on the farm shall be deferred?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If he is producing substantial amounts of the food supplies which the country needs, he ought to be deferred.

Mr. PEPPER. He ought not to be deferred if someone else can be put in his place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Merely because he is the son of a farmer; that should be no reason for not deferring him.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator regard the pending bill as one which would be of very much help to the farmer if it were passed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Indeed I do, or I should not be trying to have it passed.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the bill give the farmers all the assistance the Senator wants to give them in cultivating and harvesting their crops?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not trying to give the farmers anything. I am trying to do something which will result in the production of food for the people of the United States, for our armed forces, and to fulfill our responsibilities in enemy territory.

Mr. PEPPER. I am entirely in sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but what I am suggesting is that it is only a partial solution of the problem. In some cases it may actually do injustice, in favor of one man as against someone who has already gone to war.

I mean to suggest, with apologies to the Senator and in compliment to the spirit of the proposed legislation, that I do not believe it would guarantee labor to the farmer. The farm labor problem in Florida would not be solved if we should pass the pending bill. I should like to see the able Senator and his committee and the very able and distinguished Senator who is responsible for the bill try to draft more comprehensive legislation which would guarantee an adequate supply of labor to the farmer and give proper discretion to some one—either the agricultural representatives in a given county or to the draft board—to pass on particular cases so that injustice would not be done anyone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As the Senator from Florida has said, the pending bill may not be a cure-all. We may realize only a part of the results we are hoping for; but it would certainly be of some value.

Mr. PEPPER. With the permission of the Senator I should like to make one further comment. We are freezing

farm boys on the farms and in the jobs where they are now, without any regard to the wages which they are being paid in the jobs they now occupy. I am in favor of the principle of occupational deferment. I think we should have had it from the beginning. Not only should industrial occupational deferment be provided for by a board which knows something about industry, but agricultural deferment should be taken care of by a committee or agency which knows something about the needs of agriculture. As I understand, in England the authorities do not freeze a worker in a factory unless they are satisfied about the wage rate and the working conditions in the factory. We know very well that there are places in this country where the wages which farm laborers receive are pitiful. In some sections of my State farm wages have barely reached \$3 a day.

I am not sure that it is altogether fair to a farm boy who is diligent and faithful in the performance of his duties to compel him to accept any rate of wage which a farmer may be willing to pay him, or which he may have been willing to accept for work in the past, and say to him that he cannot leave that particular job and accept employment where he would be paid more—essentially out of the public treasury of his country—than he has been receiving on the farm. As I have already said, we should be fair as between man and man. I do not believe it is fair to a farm boy to allow a neighbor's son to work in an airplane or tank factory and receive \$8 to \$10 a day, or work in a shipyard and receive \$300 a month, while the first boy is frozen by law and required to work on the farm and receive not more than \$1.50 or \$2 a day when he is able to make more.

I believe those factors are entitled to consideration, and I am afraid that under the terms of the able Senator's bill discretion is not vested in anybody to make fair adjustments as between man and man. I am afraid the committee has not gone quite far enough to take comprehensive steps which would guarantee labor to the farmers. I agree that it is the job of the Food Administrator to see to it that the farmer has labor, but this bill would not accomplish that end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course we differ with the Senator from Florida with regard to the effectiveness of the bill. We know it will help and will provide labor on the farms; and we know the importance of producing food for the Army. In my opinion, as I have already stated, it is just as important to produce food as it is to carry a gun, and there is no difference between the two services so far as the war effort is concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said we should work out a comprehensive plan so that the farmers in Florida and the farmers in California and the farmers in Montana and the farmers throughout the other sections of the country may be assured of having sufficient help. I agree

with him that that should be done. It should be done for the simple reason that anyone who views the present picture knows that at the present time we are having to furnish food to Russia; and, as a matter of fact, Russia has indicated, as I understand from reliable authority, that at the present time she is more anxious to have food shipped to her than to have equipment. We are having to ship food to north Africa, not only to our armies, but to the armies of other nations there, and also for the natives.

In addition, we have to send food to Great Britain. That food is being sold in the stores there, as has been pointed out here. We are sending food all over the world to keep people from starving and to keep them friendly.

We have to send food abroad to feed our soldiers. Furthermore, we are the arsenal of democracy, and we are trying to furnish a part of the equipment needed by Russia. We have sent Russia over a billion dollars' worth of equipment. We are not only helping to equip the Russian Army, the British Army, the Chinese Army, our Army in north Africa, the French Army in north Africa, and our armed forces elsewhere, but we are shipping equipment to South America and we are shipping machinery to Russia. We are undertaking to do that, and at the same time we are undertaking to raise an armed force of 11,000,000 men. The truth about it—and we ought to face it—is that we are not going to be able to furnish men to go to work on the farms in Florida, in Montana, and in California; we are not going to be able to furnish the men needed by our factories that are turning out war equipment, and we are not going to be able to have enough food to feed the people of Europe when we go into Europe, so that we can keep the people of Europe and of other foreign countries from "going Communist," unless we have a surplus of food in the United States.

We are the richest and the most powerful Nation on the face of the globe. We all admit it, and everyone recognizes it. However, regardless of how rich or how powerful we may be, we are not going to be able to keep all those people supplied with food and clothes and equipment, and at the same time fight a war and raise an Army of 11,000,000 men. We must not only raise this huge armed force but we must send them to the four corners of the world, and build the ships in which to send them there. The failure to realize that is what is fundamentally wrong today in connection with the production of our food supply.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri when he says that we are locking the door after the horse is stolen. The boys on the farms have left. Single men and married men have left the farms of Montana; they have left the farms all over the country. They have left them to go into factories in Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, and San Diego, in Connecticut, and Massachusetts. They have left them because the factories are paying higher wages. No one objects to their receiving high wages; but some of the manufacturers who are operating on a cost-plus basis have more men than they need; and the more they pay them and

the more men they have, the more money they receive. Under those circumstances we are not going to do the job we should do.

The other day the New York Times published a very potent editorial, which I had printed in the *Record*. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with the matter I have been discussing.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator will yield further for a moment, I simply desire to call attention to the editorial which was published in the New York Times. Certainly the New York Times has supported the administration's farm policy all down the line. It could not be classified by the Vice President or anyone else as being isolationist. Even Walter Winchell could not classify it as an isolationist publication. It was one of the strongest supporters of the administration's foreign policy, and probably was more of an interventionist than even the President himself. Yet the New York Times has taken the position that an army of 11,000,000 men may be too large. It calls attention to its position in an editorial entitled "The Size of the Army." The editorial is one of the longest editorials which have been published in that newspaper in a long time. The editorial calls attention to the fact that an army of 5,000,000 men may be more effective than an army of 10,000,000 or 11,000,000. It is one of the strongest and best and most recent editorials relative to the whole situation I have seen anywhere. It states that the fact that a man is in favor of a small army is no reason why he should be considered to be suggesting that he wants a soft war—nothing of the kind—but that he wants an effective army.

Everyone who visits the camps and who has traveled over the country knows that there is a waste of manpower in the factories and also in the bureaus in Washington. Go down to any one of them—I care not which may be selected—there will be found employees falling all over themselves—some of them single men, others married men whose wives are working and drawing large salaries and wages. There is no justification for that situation.

That is one reason why we have a shortage of farm workers; and the shortage will continue regardless of whether or not we pass the pending bill.

I shall vote for the bill, but I simply say that we should not delude ourselves by believing that the passage of the bill will solve the problem; for it will not solve it. Nothing else will solve it, and it will grow worse and worse if we attempt to raise an Army of 11,000,000 men. Someone has said, "We should do whatever the military authorities say." The New York Times says that the present problem is not simply a military one, and that in figuring out what we should do and what size Army we should have we must take into consideration the needs of agriculture, the needs of our war production in munitions factories, and the over-all picture throughout the country. If we do not take all those factors into consideration we shall bring

about disaster to our own system of government.

We have gone about the job in a hodge-podge way. Probably no one is particularly to blame for that; we are all to blame for it. Someone has blamed the local draft boards. They are not to blame for the situation. They were told to get so many men, and they went out and got them.

Let me say that I have prepared an amendment which I think I shall offer to the pending bill, providing that married men with children shall be exempted. Why do I favor doing so? Simply because of the fact that when we draft young married men we seriously affect the welfare of their wives and children. Someone has said that we should be fair, and that we should not exempt anyone by law. However, the President of the United States exempted some persons. I am not criticizing him; but I say he exempted men between the ages of 38 and 45 years. He did so by Executive order. He said that such men should not be taken, whether they are single men or married men with dependent children or otherwise. Why should we exempt a single man between the ages of 38 and 45 years? When we talked to the representatives of the Army who appeared before our committees they said that single men between the ages of 38 and 45 years should be exempted because a great many of them broke down and had to be sent to hospitals after they were trained for active service and were made to march 20 miles while carrying a heavy pack, and that of course they could not stand up under such service.

However, we shall have to use more than a million men in our army, not in combat service, but in doing mechanical work, in service at the airports, and so forth. A million or a million and a half men will be needed in such work. Men between the ages of 38 and 45 years employed in such work are doing a hard day's work. They are being taken into the service; but if a married man with dependent children is taken in, will his mind be on the war effort? When he is stationed at a camp, what kind of a soldier will he make? What will he be thinking about? He will be thinking about the mother and his children.

By way of illustration let me point out that I have working in my office two young men—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I must proceed with my remarks.

Mr. WHEELER. I assure the Senator that I shall finish in a moment or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to yield very much longer. I will yield in order to hear the Senator's story.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely want to finish what I was saying. As I said, two young men are now working in my office. Each of them is married and has two children. When those young men are taken into the Army, their wives will have to go to work in order to support the children, and the children will have to be placed in some kind of an institution. I say that we should exempt the young

married men who are raising families; because if we do not do so we shall destroy homes and shall adversely affect children; and in addition to all that, the fathers who are taken into the armed forces will not make good soldiers, anyway.

I shall vote for some kind of legislation on this subject, but I fear that what we may enact will not do the work which we desire to have done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senator will not offer his amendment with relation to family deferment.

I promised to yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] very briefly and then to the Senator from North Dakota. After that, I should like to proceed. I desire to speak only for a few minutes longer, and I should like to finish. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I have heard several Senators this afternoon express great concern over the evils of group deferment, and I thought it would be well to remind them that in the original selective service we deferred 20 or 25 groups, and one of the outstanding groups deferred as a group is made up of Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for that contribution. I think it is a complete answer to those who are greatly disturbed by blanket deferment. Now I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has made the statement I was going to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall proceed with the bill. I have only a little more to offer. The Tydings amendment, in my opinion, was enacted in good faith. It was thought at the time it would solve the problem. I thought it would solve it; I thought it was a great achievement and a marked step forward; I thought the farmers would be given an opportunity to remain on the farm and that the adoption of the amendment would result in keeping men on the farm. Unfortunately, it has not worked in that way. I have received numerous telegrams and letters on this subject. I have picked out 3 from my correspondence, because I received them today and because they come from 3 different quarters of my State. First, I read a telegram received this morning from the southeastern section of Colorado addressed to me:

ROCKY FORD, COLO., March 9, 1943.
Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,

Washington, D. C.:
Say, Ed., who in Washington outranks a local draft board? Saturday by radio and Sunday by Associated Press we are told that local boards are to defer farm workers. It took a big load off my mind, and thought that all we had to do now was to go ahead and feed the Army. The time of the year to plant is here and we are all ready to start planting onions and beets and carrots. And now I am advised by the local draft board's attorney that the press report was baloney.

G. A. BLOTZ.

Mr. Blotz is well known to me as a farmer in the Arkansas Valley. He

farms a very large acreage, and is very sincere in his statements. I now read from a letter I received from Durango in the southwest corner of the State. The letter is addressed to me. The writer and her husband, who are engaged in the cattle business, applied for deferment for their son. The father is in bad health, and without the boy's help they cannot continue to produce beef on their farm. I read one of the paragraphs of the letter. It is addressed to me by Mrs. Wayne McCaw of Durango, Colo.:

John Craig, clerk of our local draft board, said that the farm draft-deferment talk was mostly propaganda or "candy coating to appease the farmers." He made light of the whole affair and said that all that is wanted is to defer the head of the farm family. If Mr. Craig is right, farmers and the general public certainly have been deceived. Business people here and other generally well informed people are under the impression that farmers and their sons and other farm workers are to be deferred. Just any number of people have said to us, "Your boy won't be called now—I see by the papers that all necessary farm workers are to be deferred."

The clerk of the local draft board says that deferment talk is "candy coating to appease the farmers."

I have a letter from my own section of the State, the northwest corner of the State. It is from R. F. Magor, Jr., who is president of the Western Slope Cattle Growers' Association, with headquarters at Rifle, Colo. I quote from the letter as follows:

It seems to me that there are a great many bartenders, clerks, restaurant workers, filling station men, and dozens of others whose jobs could be filled by women and these men could go to Army or defense plants, leaving experienced farm labor, whether married or single, to carry on production. I can't see the idea of sacrificing the livestock industry or farming industry at this time.

This is really becoming serious and production will show it next year. For instance, they have just taken another of my farm hands, who is feeding 800 cattle and cannot be replaced, in class A-1.

At present we are running 2,000 head of cattle, 9,600 sheep, and 350 hogs. I asked for exemption of only 4 men; one of them 36 years old and married. This one they just put in I-A is 1 of the 4. I don't see how I can run with any less experienced men. I have to step now to keep old men and cripples enough in to keep going.

And so on. These are recent letters. I could spend the day reading into the Record what is happening in my State.

I wish to concur in what has been said about the draft boards. They are composed of good and patriotic citizens, excellent businessmen, the finest kind of men. They are our neighbors, and they know about their communities. Unfortunately, however, in Colorado almost every board is made up entirely of professional and businessmen, lawyers, dentists, doctors, and others. Very few farmers are on the draft boards. Only in rare cases is a farmer found on one of the draft boards. A draft board receives an order from the State Selective Service Board that calls for a quota. The local board is told, "You have got to fill this quota." It is a temptation to them which they cannot resist; they have no way

of getting away from it. They take in one neighbor's boy, but here is another boy and they have to take him; they have no choice in the matter. They have to fill the quota and right now they are scraping the bottom of the barrel in order to fill the quota. It is only natural for them to take boys from the farm and send them away to the Army. A boy is not going to object.

So it is up to the Congress to meet this situation squarely and fairly. This bill does it. It takes the burden from the shoulders of the local selective service boards. They can depend upon the mandatory direction contained in this bill to answer the queries which will come to them from their neighbors and friends as to why they took one boy and did not take another. We must not leave this matter to their discretion because they are under too much pressure to stand up under that sort of a discretionary power. They have taken boys all over the country; now they are trying to stop, but it is pretty hard for them to stop; indeed they cannot do it. So if we are going to keep any boys on the farm at all, if we are going to make it possible for the farmers to continue operations we must put into the law a mandatory deferment provision for their protection.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am so much concerned with the constantly changing views and continuously changing regulations of the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission that I want briefly to discuss a matter which is tearing at the heartstrings of millions of Americans.

Particularly disturbing, and none too clear to me, are the very recent announcements of the War Manpower Commission concerning farm labor, and news stories further referring to the drafting of married men. All of us are aware, Mr. President, that it is necessary in time of war that Government operate to a considerable extent on the basis of trial and error; and Heaven knows we have had our full share of that. No fair person would deny that in connection with the manufacture of the munitions of war and the rationing of food and other products and materials errors are unavoidable. We expected them, many of them, but I never expected, and I doubt that many others did, that we would practice the trial and error procedure to the extent that it has been followed with human beings. For month after month we have been kept in constant turmoil in connection with the drafting of men for service in the armed forces and in the handling of the manpower problem. And while this seemingly endless confusion has gone on men and women have suffered great mental anguish and wondered when their Government might adopt a policy that would permit them to make further plans for themselves and for their children. They want to know where they stand.

For all of the years that I have been a Member of Congress I have made it a practice to avoid indulging in personalities. I have avoided the criticism of in-

dividuals—and have ever been anxious to pass over unsound and unwise and sometimes silly statements and regulations or rulings. It has seemed to me that in time of war criticism for the sake of criticizing should be avoided, but I have never been unmindful of the fact that we here in the Senate are in the principal watchtower and that in the final analysis we are charged with all of the mistakes of the Federal Government. We have the power, as well as a solemn responsibility, and while war makes it necessary that we delegate great powers to the Chief Executive, which he in turn delegates to certain of the departments of Government, when there is evidence that the powers are being abused—or when mistakes are obvious—we are chiefly to blame if we do not insist upon the correction of the abuses or mistakes.

If we insist that all young men who have been engaged in agriculture or any other of the great industries of our country are to be denied active association with their fellow Americans of the armed forces, we undertake a procedure and policy that is not in keeping with the fundamental and sound and age-old practices of our Government.

There are tens of thousands of farm families in my State—and I am not in the least unmindful of our reliance upon agriculture. I know that if farmers were to organize as labor has organized and should take advantage of the force at their command regardless of consequences, the results might well be disastrous. But I anticipate no such attitude on the part of those solid Americans on whom America has so much depended for more than 300 years.

No man can make me believe that there is less patriotism on the farms than in the urban communities of our land, and none can make me believe that our farm problem can be adjusted only by placing the heaviest burden of war upon those who live in the cities, or that it is at this time necessary to promiscuously draft the heads of families in order to win the war. Most Senators know that thousands of young men from the farms have temporarily abandoned their agricultural pursuits to engage in the manufacture of the munitions of war. Is it fair, because of this migration from the farm, that only the city dweller, even though he has four or five children, shall engage in conflict? I fail to see wisdom or necessity in the proposal, and, while it may be the easy way from the standpoint of those who are writing the regulations, and giving the orders, I think that it is a grievous mistake for which we may never forgive ourselves unless we undertake to correct it at once. I cannot believe that those in charge of selective service, and the manpower problem, are unable to develop a more sound policy, if it can be called a policy, than has been practiced up to now.

It seems to me that it is possible to work out a plan whereby people in the cities, or near the farms, can contribute a portion of their time to agriculture. It will mean some inconvenience, of course, but there are thousands and thousands of people sufficiently skilled who can contribute a large part of their time to the

planting and harvesting of crops, and to the other farm work which must be carried on. Some time ago the President suggested that those below the draft ages could contribute, and although some disagreed with his opinion, I know that in my State, much to my regret, even little children have in the past done much work on farms. And every Senator knows that men and women not particularly skilled have harvested the crops in certain parts of our country for many, many years.

Mr. President, I will not now attempt to discuss the farm question in detail—because committees of the Senate are now devoting much of their time to that study—but I am particularly concerned with the great problem presented as it is proposed to call married men into the armed forces.

Earlier this year I engaged in correspondence with the Director of Selective Service on the question of drafting family men. At that time I expressed the view that, subject to military necessities, family men should not be called into the armed service while single men were still available. I also proposed that when and if it became necessary to take family men into the Army, it should be done on a sliding scale, with appropriate recognition given to the age of the family man and the number of his children.

I felt impelled to express these views because I had become convinced that under demands for an Army of great numbers, the Selective Service Act, enacted in peacetime, did not provide a rational basis for the orderly drafting of large groups of family men. The Selective Service Act was conceived as a method for providing military training to approximately 2,000,000 men a year during peacetime for the purpose of building up a reserve for time of war. But I doubt that any Member of the Senate at the time supposed that our armed forces, even in time of war, would ever exceed five or six million men.

Upon that basis, the mechanisms for selection as provided by the act seemed reasonable. We would have a registration of men within stated age limits. We would establish their order of call by a lottery, and then we would rely upon broad classifications of exemption to take care of the particular cases of hardship which the lottery system necessarily would create. If we were taking only 2,000,000 men a year out of a civilian population of in excess of 130,000,000, such a system could be made to work without disturbing dislocations of community or family life.

But what has happened within the 3 years which have intervened? We are now at war; and our obligations in that war are not merely to create the manpower necessary for a victorious Army and Navy, but also to feed in substantial measure a majority of the people of the civilized world not at war with us; to equip in great measure the armed forces of our allies; and to maintain this country as the heart of the great battle—a heart which must be kept pulsating strongly and regularly.

To be concrete, we are asked not only to man the greatest arsenal of warfare

the world has ever known, to man the creation and maintenance of the bread basket of the world, but also to build, equip, and maintain armed forces of our own which already are estimated in excess of 10,000,000 men.

These are gigantic, unprecedented tasks. They involve responsibilities which can be fulfilled only with a truly united America whose morale is not meanwhile shattered through the arbitrariness and, if I may say so, the ineptitude of a bureaucracy gone hog wild.

I am not passing judgment upon the decision of our military leaders. They continue to hold my confidence. I can realize that, especially in time of war, theirs is the responsibility for anticipating every emergency. I can understand that while molding divisions and tank forces for offensive operations, they must also be erecting new bulwarks of defense which probably never will be needed, but which if needed would be ready. I can realize, too, that in the far-flung strategy of this war, the United States becomes the hub—the nerve center—and the reservoir of ready reserves in men and equipment to be available for transport in all directions at once. I can even imagine that our salvation may ultimately be in our own national strength as a military power, and that for all the matériel and men we send to our allies, we must still keep here an undiminished nucleus of our own power.

With full recognition of these military necessities, I still am privileged, as a Member of the Senate, to question the methods which are announced to meet the undisclosed requirements.

For instance, having participated in the enactment of a peacetime Selective Service Act, I certainly am privileged to study the operation of that statute in time of war. And, since the recent announcement of the War Manpower Commission as to the imminence of drafting family men between the ages of 18 and 38, I have considered it my duty to study the proposals under which men shall now be taken from their children.

Do not consider for a moment that in these broader questions of national policy the military bureaus of this Capital City are endowed with an omniscience which is withheld from those of us who ponder the problems of the country in civilian roles.

When appropriate study and report are compatible with national welfare, I am certain that the headlong drafting of men over 38 years into the Army during the first year of the war will be shown to have been ridiculous. There is already testimony of our military leaders to support that statement. In spite of that testimony, they are going to try it again.

But why was the mistake made? In my opinion it was based in the short-sighted self-assurance of the Selective Service Bureau, which felt qualified to administer under stress of war a draft system designed for military training in peace. It seems that the same superabundance of self-assurance still exists. This time it appears to be in the War Manpower Commission.

I am afraid the same bureau is making still another such mistake in its now

rather hysterical warnings about the drafting of family men. I have read with great care the recent pronouncements of the War Manpower Commission and the public addresses of its spokesmen. I am mindful that as yet the list of so-called nonessential industries and enterprises and nondeferable occupations is small and covers hardly more than the obvious. But if the necessities for a large Army are truly stated, and if the statements are true that most family men of draft age will within the year be called upon to move either into essential work or be drafted into the armed service, then this list of nonessential occupations is going to grow very rapidly. And so, unless we are not being told the truth, the family men up to 38, or perhaps 45, years of age are today faced with the necessity of reorganizing their lives and the lives of their families right now.

Upon that basis I want to know how this Selective Service System is going to work. Let us consider a concrete example.

Under registration you have two men: One, 37 years old with six children; another 25 years old with one child. The family of each is wholly dependent for support upon the earnings of the father. If the man 37 years old with six children has a low number, he is drafted ahead of the man 25 years old with one child.

Is there any sensible person who believes that the mother of six dependent children should be required to shift for herself before the mother with one? I know that we cannot weigh family anxieties quantitatively, but I also know that it is easier under all the circumstances for the young mother with one child to make the unfortunate adjustments involved in this war than it is for the older mother with six children.

Yet, with all the press releases, the promulgation of rules and regulations, and the Nation-wide hook-ups, I have yet to be informed of how the Selective Service authorities intend to meet this question. I know that to local boards is delegated authority to make deferments in cases of hardship, but that is not enough. Our manpower draft is becoming so gigantic, so widespread, so pervasive in every community of the land, that if uniform regulations are not soon prepared, we of the Congress will have to legislate them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.
Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say that, in addition to the inadequacy of the law as it presently exists, there may be in one county a great many single men and in the adjoining county there may be no single men, or comparatively few single men. Under such conditions one county would take married men with children and in the adjoining county married men with children would be exempt.

Mr. MALONEY. That is quite true.
Mr. WHEELER. The same statement applies to States. In some States most of the single men have gone to work in factories. Possibly only married men

with children are left. Consequently married men with children in some States will be taken first, while in other States many single men will not be taken.

Mr. MALONEY. Even with all his great knowledge, I think the able Senator from Montana would be greatly surprised if he knew exactly how many tens of thousands—I dare say hundreds of thousands—of the young men from the farms of this country have turned their backs upon the farms to go into the munitions plants.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that is absolutely true.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, to me it is a relatively simple problem to solve. For instance, if we are to take married men, all family men between, let us say, the ages of 18 and 25, should be taken first. Within that group, those with the least number of children should be taken first. Then would follow the second age group, between 25 and 30, and finally the last group over 30. I fail to see where there is any complication in that very simple proposition.

It will be said that such a plan is unnecessarily complicated since all are to be taken within the year. Such a rejoinder seems to me to smack of the bureaucratic arbitrariness which is becoming this country's greatest political evil.

Let no bureaucrat tell me that even a year's deferment to a family man of 37 years with 6 dependent children is not something to be insisted upon.

I shall have more to say on this subject. It seems to me the time has come for a constructive survey of our Selective Service System. I ask each Senator to search his own experience, his own knowledge, and his own understanding, to find whether the following questions are answered to his satisfaction:

First. Have all available single men, uniformly in all parts of the country, been made properly subject to military call?

Second. Are the local draft boards functioning with sufficient freedom and, consequently, fairness?

Third. Are the millions in public service called as quickly and as readily to the Army as their fellow citizens in private life?

Fourth. Will the expanding list of nonessential industries and occupations include unnecessary governmental bureaus and offices as well as units of our private economy?

I have said before and I repeat with great emphasis: Our fighting morale will be measured by the common sense, the fairness and the honesty of our draft laws. The time has come when a committee of the Congress should look very carefully into the matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor. Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

CONDEMNATION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR OUTRAGES INFLICTED UPON CIVILIANS IN NAZI-OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, obviously the Senate cannot today finish

consideration of the bill now before it. I desire to have an executive session, and I also wish to have considered a concurrent resolution which I submitted last Friday. Therefore, I hope the consideration of the pending bill may be temporarily suspended.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, which is on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) as follows:

Whereas the American people view with indignation the atrocities inflicted upon the civilian population in the Nazi occupied countries, and especially the mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children; and

Whereas this policy of the Nazis has created a reign of terror, brutality, and extermination in Poland and other countries in Eastern and Central Europe; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That these brutal and indefensible outrages against millions of helpless men, women, and children should be, and they are hereby, condemned as unworthy of any nation or any regime which pretends to be civilized:

Resolved further, That the dictates of humanity and honorable conduct in war demand that this inexcusable slaughter and mistreatment shall cease and that it is the sense of this Congress that those guilty, directly or indirectly, of these criminal acts shall be held accountable and punished in a manner commensurate with the offenses for which they are responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say simply a word regarding the concurrent resolution. We are all familiar with the fact that the Nazis, under the pagan domination of Hitler, have brought about the slaughter of more than 2,000,000 Jews in occupied countries of Europe. There is in the world a total population of about 15,000,000 Jews. Six and a half million of them are in the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations, leaving approximately eight and one-half million in other countries. It is almost unbelievable that since the war was brought on by Hitler, more than 2,000,000 of these Jewish men, women, and children have been slaughtered—not killed in battle, but murdered, slaughtered outright—for no reason except that they are members of the Jewish race or religion. The Parliament of England recently adopted a resolution condemning that sort of conduct which does not conform with any honorable conception of warfare among nations. The Secretary of State last week issued a statement which called attention to the fact that the representatives of the United States and Great Britain are to meet soon in Ottawa to discuss this problem, with a view to trying to find some solution or remedy. Last week the Governor of New York set today as a day of mourning all over the State of New York for and on behalf of the 2,000,000 Jews who have been slaughtered by Hitler and by the Nazi regime. It seemed

to me appropriate that on this day the Senate of the United States should adopt a resolution condemning that sort of conduct. It is for that reason that I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1938, vice William M. Leiserson.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Stephen R. MacRae, from the State of North Carolina, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Wallace P. Studencki, from the State of Indiana, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Chicago regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Luke White, from the State of Indiana, to be senior attorney at \$4,600 per annum in the office of the general counsel of the War Manpower Commission;

Bernard L. Gorfinkle, from the State of Massachusetts, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Russell C. McCarthy, from the State of New York, to be area director at \$5,600 per annum in the Rochester area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Wilberforce D. Simmons, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant at \$4,600 per annum in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Olaf K. Fjetland, from the State of Michigan, to be area director at \$4,600 per annum in the Saginaw area office of the War Manpower Commission;

Paul N. Devine, from the State of Maine, to be area director at \$4,600 per annum in the New Bedford-Fall River area office of the War Manpower Commission;

James K. Johnson, from the State of Ohio, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum in the Cleveland regional office of the War Manpower Commission;

Grafton L. Brown, from the State of Maryland, to be field supervisor at \$4,600 per annum in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission; and

Charlotte E. Carr, from the State of Illinois, to be assistant to the deputy chairman

at \$6,500 per annum in the War Manpower Commission.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Curtis L. Waller to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THURMAN W. ARNOLD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold to be associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold, but I desire the country to know that I do so with deepest reluctance and regret, because to me his elevation to the Court of Appeals is more like a funeral than a celebration.

It is my belief that no lawyer holding an official position in recent years has begun to approach the magnificent work which has been accomplished by Mr. Arnold as Assistant Attorney General of the United States. He comes from the State of Wyoming. He was educated in an eastern college and has lived in Washington for several years. He is conversant with the economic problems of the country. I agree with almost everything he has done except entering into consent decrees, and particularly those relating to the major oil companies.

Saddened as I am, nevertheless I realize that each man lives his own life. Mr. Arnold has made the decision that he desires this position, so who am I to say that I am right and he is wrong?

Only last week the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] delivered an address in the Senate against super-big-business monopolies following the war. Mr. Arnold deals with the subject in chapter 2 of his book entitled "Democracy and Free Enterprise," under the heading "The efficiency of industrial democracy."

Mr. President, I believe this chapter to be the greatest which has ever come from the pen of Thurman Arnold. I believe it should be made compulsory reading in every high school and college in America. I ask that the chapter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the chapter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY AND FREE ENTERPRISE

II. THE EFFICIENCY OF INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

This war has often been described as a struggle between capitalism and totalitarian economy. In the past few years totalitarian economy, judged on the basis of results without regard for the desirability of the means, has been a better producer than the capitalis-

tic system. And thus arises the myth of totalitarian efficiency.

Yet, if we analyze this so-called totalitarian efficiency, we find that our capitalistic economy, with all its faults, was always more efficient in the techniques of production than Germany. Our industrial technicians had outstripped those of every other country in the world. We had greater production per man-hour of labor than any other country in the world. In other words our capitalistic economy was not less efficient in production; it was lagging behind in spite of the fact that it was more efficient. This is a paradox that needs explanation.

The answer, as I see it, is that we were suffering from an economic disease which is endemic in all commercial civilization—the disease of cartelization, or hardening of the arteries of commerce. The cause of that disease is the desire of the leaders of industry to protect themselves against new enterprise. They have struggled to the top after exhausting efforts. They want to make their achievement permanent. They feel they need a rest. Therefore, they think that it is their right to stop newcomers from getting into the charmed circle and bothering them. The stuff which newcomers have to sell at prices which endanger their dividends is called a surplus, or distress production. The only way to get rid of that surplus is to keep newcomers from producing. But you can't stop newcomers from producing in order to stabilize their price structure unless you organize and merge and then organize and merge all over again. It takes a lot of power to stabilize the economy in a new enterprise. For example, in 1920, 25 percent of copper was produced by three companies in the United States. In 1930, 40 percent was concentrated in the same hands. Today the three companies control 81 percent. It took that much concentration of power to stabilize copper prices and eliminate the surplus. Incidentally, it was also necessary for the cartel to combine with Chilean interests and control the foreign market. Without these superhuman efforts, extending all over the world, our present shortage would not have been possible. It was all done by business leaders who thought that surplus spelled economic disaster.

In the same way the disease of cartelization progressed in other industries; concentration grew to an alarming extent, particularly in the basic materials which are the source of all industrial production. The building up of these organizations did more than simply create shortages in basic war materials. It led to the development of an economy divided into two economic worlds.

The first was the world of organized industry; the second was the world of small, unorganized businessmen, farmers, laborers, and consumers. In the first world, there was the power to maintain high prices no matter how much the demand for the product fell off. When this power was exercised, purchasing power was curtailed, production dropped, men were laid off. This, in turn, lowered purchasing power and made demand drop still further. A vicious downward spiral was set in operation. In the second world, unlimited competition still existed and could not be controlled. In this world lived the farmers, retailers, and small businessmen who supply the consumers with both goods and labor. Here, when the supply increased or the demand fell off, prices dropped to the bottom, but the people went right on producing as much as the conditions of the market would permit. In the first world we had concentrated control, which makes possible high and rigid prices. These, in turn, led to restriction of production and wholesale discharge of labor. In the second world, we found competition among these groups, low flexible prices, large production, and labor standards often at starvation levels.

The final result, before the unbalanced industrial boom created by the present war, has nowhere been better described than by President Roosevelt in his monopoly message of 1935. He said:

"Statistics of the Bureau of Internal Revenue reveal the following amazing figures for 1935:

"Ownership of corporate assets: Of all corporations reporting from every part of the Nation, one-tenth of 1 percent of them owned 52 percent of the assets of all of them.

"And to clinch the point: Of all corporations reporting, less than 5 percent of them owned 87 percent of all the assets of all of them.

"Income and profits of corporations: Of all the corporations reporting from every part of the country, one-tenth of 1 percent of them earned 50 percent of the net income of all of them.

"And to clinch the point: Of all the manufacturing corporations reporting, less than 4 percent of them earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all of them."

All this is history. It is an old story to the farmers of this country. However, I present it as background, since it bears on the economic problem which the present has forced on the unorganized industries of this country. Billions of dollars had to be poured into this unbalanced economic structure under the pressure of sheer immediate necessity. This necessity brought into sharp relief how our antiproducer monopoly control had been working.

We suddenly woke up to find acute shortages in every basic noncompetitive industry. We are short of power in a country abounding in power; we are short of metals and chemicals; we are short of transportation; we are short of skilled labor. In every industry which has been able to restrict supply in order to put a floor under prices, we find a lack of capacity. This lack of capacity is not hurting the industries which are responsible for these shortages. The burden is being borne entirely by independent businessmen and farmers whose supplies are being cut off by the imposition of priorities.

Prior to the war America had developed the greatest industrial efficiency and skill in the world. When war broke out it was handicapped in the use of that efficiency only because of a lack of basic materials—which would have been just as useful in building cheap houses for the city or cheap equipment for the farm as for tanks and airplanes. In other words, failure to fill housing and farm needs in peace was one of the reasons why we were short of materials in war.

For years, our economic system and that of the British had been overwhelmingly concerned with preserving the security and the income of established and dominant groups. These groups stifled new productive enterprise in order to protect themselves against competition. They limited their own output to prevent what they called "a surplus." They failed to expand their productive capacity because they feared expansion might lead to future competition or future surpluses. They were afraid of industrial plenty, which alone can give a nation wealth in peace or strength in war.

Let me illustrate. In 1931 there was a growing world surplus of aluminum which threatened to invade American markets and disturb the monopoly control and the price structure of the Aluminum Co. of America. So that company formed a Canadian affiliate called Aluminum Limited, thinking that in this way it could escape the antitrust laws and could join with the aluminum monopolies of other countries to prevent threatened world competition by eliminating the surplus. World production was drastically limited to prevent new surpluses. Minimum world prices were fixed.

The plan to keep up prices by restricting world production rolled merrily along, until

Hitler came into power. He had no patience with any limitation on German production, but he was delighted with the idea of limiting production abroad. And so Hitler, in return for permission to produce unlimited quantities at home, promised that he would not increase his exports and thus disturb the world prices which the cartels were trying to maintain. And so the democracies were free to pursue their policy of eliminating what they foolishly thought was a dangerous domestic surplus without fear of invasion of their markets by German competition. Under this arrangement, Hitler doubled and tripled aluminum production for aircraft and war materials. The democracies stood still. When the war came, Germany was producing one-third to one-half more aluminum than America.

Even the collapse of France failed to wake up the aluminum industry to the dangerous shortage which its policy of limiting production had created. In 1940, when the Antitrust Division was attempting to prove a shortage of aluminum for war needs, the Aluminum Co. of America denied it. Wishful thinkers in industry, instinctively fearing over-production of basic materials, swallowed these statements with relief. And thus the pressure to build up competing production was momentarily relieved.

Now we know there is a shortage, but we could have saved precious time and precious materials had we not listened to the wishful thinking of the men whose financial interest lay in preventing new production in order to preserve their monopoly control after the war.

In 1940 steel was already running from 92 to 97 percent of capacity. But those in control of the industry did not like to think of a coming shortage, because it meant that we should have to build new plants, each of which, after the war, would be a competitive threat to the orderly control of the industry by those already established in it.

In other words, perhaps we had better not build up the steel production that we so imperatively need today because it might give steel to buyers of automobiles and tin cans and steel construction at too low prices after the war. Steel companies during the war should not be expected to expand plants which might hurt their dividends after the war.

Not only did cartelization create an unbalanced economy between different groups of producers and consumers, it also prevented the development of the resources of the South and West. It created a geographical unbalance of our economy as well as an unbalance between farmers and industry.

For the past 20 years the economy of the South and West has been developing along colonial lines. The industrial East has been the mother country. The South and West have been the colonies. The colonies have furnished the mother country with raw material. The mother country has been exploiting the colonies by selling them manufactured necessities at artificially controlled prices. New York City has been the financial and industrial center of the Nation. The industrial East has been the principal source of both capital and organization to develop the South and West. Under such conditions, it has been natural enough that the South and West have been developed in a way which would contribute the most to the domination of the industrial East. Wherever it has interfered with eastern industrial domination, the competitive energy of the South and West has been stifled. Local independent capital in the South and West has been gradually disappearing. Local independent enterprise has been under a constant handicap. The farmer has been the chief victim.

How all this happened is a complicated process. Big business has treated the West

and South primarily as a source of raw materials, not as a place to manufacture and sell finished products at competitive prices. This is the age-old principle of colonial empires. It is dictated by the necessity of keeping up dividends in the mother country against cheaper local competition in the colonies. The methods of maintaining control of industrial markets in the South and West are based on the power of tightly organized cartels to control supply, transportation, and distribution in such a way as to put new competing enterprise in the colonies under a continuing handicap. I will illustrate by taking a few examples from the field of transportation.

In Pueblo, Colo., there is a steel plant capable of producing a million tons a year. Such a plant in a free economy would give the farmers and consumers of the West bar steel and nails at less cost, because it would eliminate the transportation charges from Chicago. But the plant was not built for the development of the West. It is, on the contrary, operated in such a way as to preserve the dominant position of eastern steel. A farmer in Colorado who wished to buy steel bars in Pueblo had to pay \$20.38 a ton imaginary freight from Chicago. If he wished to buy a keg of wire nails he paid nearly \$1 a crate for phantom freight for a product manufactured in his own home State. In other words, he was not permitted to have any advantage from the local industry.

So much for the consumer. How about the development of more steel production in Pueblo? If the Pueblo plant wished to ship steel 50 miles east of Pueblo, the consumer paid as much for transportation as if he bought in Chicago. The whole market in the Mountain States was thus preserved for eastern industry.

In using the basing-point system as an example of price control, I do not wish to over-emphasize it. It is only one of the methods by which a few dominant concerns control the market for necessities, and is probably not the most important. The price of gasoline, for example, was controlled in part by the basing-point system. It was also controlled by the illegal use of the ethyl patents—by large oil companies' forming pools to remove competitive gasoline from the markets—by the ownership of pipe lines by major oil companies so that they might obtain rebates which would make it impossible for independents to ship on equal terms. These controls operated against the unorganized South and West in two ways: first, organized industry fixed the prices which the South and West got for their raw materials; second, it fixed the price which consumers paid for necessities. In addition to fixing prices, big business by the sheer power of large resources was able to force independents into line. This became known as price leadership, maintained, not by open conspiracy but by the fear of retaliation.

The disease of cartelization does not stop with industry. It is responsible for most of the labor practices which we now condemn labor for forcing on employers. Faced with an irreducible minimum of unemployment, labor got the idea that it was part of its function to aid in reducing the surplus which threatened the existence of its jobs. Nationwide labor organizations began to force useless and parasitic labor on employers. They adopted a policy of resisting more efficient methods of production. For the first time in the history of the United States the idea that it was legitimate for labor to sabotage production in the interest of static jobs was recognized by the courts. The Supreme Court held that it was not an unreasonable restraint of trade for a labor union in Chicago to prevent the consumers of Chicago from having ready-mixed concrete, thereby lowering the quality of concrete and raising

the cost of building in that city. As a result of such practices the development of cheaper housing has been stifled in this country. The Court arrives at the approval of such practices in a circuitous way.

In 1939 a six-room house in Cleveland cost \$1,000 more to build than the same house in Detroit. Responsible citizens reported to the Antitrust Division at the time that one of the reasons was that contractors who used prefabricated material or more economical methods were afraid to do business in Cleveland.

Who got that extra thousand dollars? The answer is that nobody got it. They just stopped building houses. In 1939 there was only \$21,000,000 in Federal Housing Authority loans for houses in Cleveland. There was \$59,000,000 in Federal Housing Authority loans in Detroit. Not even organized labor profited. The hourly wage for carpenters was higher in Cleveland than it was in Detroit. The annual income of carpenters was higher in Detroit than it was in Cleveland. Such exploitation is going on all over the country. Take a few examples at random. In Chicago a building-trades concern would not let stone which had been cut in Indiana be used. It had to be shipped in rough and cut in Chicago. Uncut stone costs 20 percent more to ship. So Chicago's freight bill goes up. Indiana is better equipped to cut stone than Chicago, so manufacturing costs go up. The stonecutters' union in Indiana, probably because of its greater efficiency in the process, gets higher wages than the Chicago union, so labor as a whole gets less wages. The result is higher building costs and less consumer purchasing power.

This idea of erecting a local protective tariff against outside products is always attractive to those who can control imports, and so it spreads rapidly. In Pittsburgh and San Francisco the carpenters' union would not allow outside millwork to be used in construction. In New York metal lathers won't allow the use of metal laths and metal rods which are not fabricated or bent on the job or in the city. In Belleville, Ill., the unions have been indicted with dealers and contractors for preventing the home owner from building a house when the structural parts are prefabricated. In Houston, Tex., master plumbers and the plumbing union insisted that pipe made for particular jobs would not be installed unless the thread were cut off and removed from the pipe and a new thread were put on at the job. They insisted that brass pipe had to be delivered without a thread on either end. This sort of thing would be funny if it were not so expensive to people on low incomes who have to cut down their food bills in order to pay higher rents.

The distribution of food in large cities is full of log-jams between the farm and the table. The teamsters in Washington, with the cheerful acquiescence of those retailers anxious to raise the price of necessities, threatened to cut off deliveries from stores selling a larger loaf of bread unless they raised their prices 40 percent. Consumers cannot protest against that beginning of a monopoly price spiral in food by refusing to buy bread and eating cake. These are quiet, peaceful holdups, as painless as a hidden sales tax. The consumer never has a chance to wire Washington to send a board of prominent men to argue on his behalf. The fight is all over before the referee can get to the scene of the trouble. You can mediate a struggle between the Bethlehem Steel Co. and an organized union. You can't mediate a struggle between consumers and the teamsters, because the consumers are down and out before the first gong rings.

Why was labor able to prevent legislation which curbed these practices? One of the reasons was that most of them were done in combination with a strong industrial group. In restricting the distribution of the milk

they had the cooperation of powerful dairy companies who did not like store delivery any more than labor did. In the distribution of plumbing they had the cooperation of great plumbing manufacturers who feared the direct selling of Sears, Roebuck. For example, in the recent indictment in the hat industry, the Government charges that a group of manufacturers joined with the unions in order to prevent milliners from converting their efforts into the production of hats for the Army. They divided the business up, they set the price, they put handicaps on any new enterprise that desired to bid. The idea of the union was to keep up their wages by restricting the manufacture of hats to people with whom they already had an agreement. The idea of the hatters was to control the manufacture of hats for the Army. Therefore, industrialists were unable to make the same kind of a whole-hearted drive to put labor under the anti-trust laws that they did in attacking the Holding Company Act. Their ranks were divided. The cartel groups were profiting from labor restrictions. Or else they were in a noncompetitive position which enabled them to pass the cost of inefficiency on to the public.

In this situation economic thought turned in two directions. Few economic thinkers, however, put any particular emphasis on stopping the disease which was creating these results. Liberals and radicals alike turned to a vague idea that the remedy lay in a planned economy. Now, of course, no Government group or industrial group can exist without making plans. However, these thinkers did not have any specific plans in mind. They were basing their faith in the thought that a set of experts could be selected who would understand the whole matter and make the plans for them. The treatises of the time on the economic health of the Nation spent most of their time pointing out the paradox of want in the midst of plenty, of idle capital and idle labor. Surely, they said, wise men if put in charge would not permit such things to happen. Therefore, let us get back of the movement to support boards of experts in the Government who will balance production and distribution.

Faced with this sort of thing big business became apologetic. It was the antithesis of individualism. It was the Russian system of government. Big business believed in managers rather than planners. These managers were the heads of the great industrial cartels. All we needed to do was to let them alone and they would get rid of the distressing surplus for us.

Under constant attack the energy of the planners died down. And then, for the first time, we began to drive along the traditional lines that have made us a great industrial democracy. The President in his remarkable message in 1938 decided on a campaign against the cartel system, which in this country is ordinarily referred to as "monopoly." That tradition consists not in hiring experts to make broad general plans but in breaking up, one at a time, the restraints on production and distribution of goods. There is nothing in it which is antithetical to any particular plan relating to any particular industrial activity. It does assume, however, that legislative plans should be adapted to specific evils and that the future of industrial democracy does not lie in any more Government control than is required to remedy specific evils. It believes that in the long run the most efficient production and distribution of goods will come from private initiative in a free market. It is based on the premise that most of our troubles have come because we have allowed private groups to protect themselves against the inconvenience of being forced to compete with new enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thurman W. Arnold to be Associate Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Arnold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH MEXICO

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive D (77th Cong., 2d sess.), a Consular Convention between the United States of America and Mexico, signed at Mexico City, on August 12, 1942, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the United Mexican States, being desirous of defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, have decided to conclude a convention for

that purpose and have appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

George S. Messersmith, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Mexico, and

The President of the United Mexican States:

Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Relations;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

1. Each High Contracting Party agrees to receive from the other High Contracting Party, consular officers in those of its ports, places, and cities, where it may be convenient and which are open to consular representatives of any foreign States.

2. Consular officers of each High Contracting Party shall, after entering upon their duties, enjoy reciprocally in the territories of the other High Contracting Party all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities which are enjoyed by consular officers of the same grade of the most favored nation, there being understood by consular officers Consuls General as well as Consuls and Vice Consuls who are not honorary. As official agents, such officers shall be entitled to the high consideration of all officials, national or local, with whom they have official intercourse in the State which receives them.

3. The Government of each High Contracting Party shall furnish free of charge the necessary exequatur of such consular officers of the other High Contracting Party as present a regular commission signed by the chief executive of the appointing State and under its great seal; and shall issue to a subordinate or substitute consular officer duly appointed by an accepted superior consular officer with the approbation of his Government, or by any other competent officer of his Government, such documents as according to the laws of the respective States shall be requisite for the exercise by the appointee of the consular function; provided in either case that the person applying for an exequatur or other document is found acceptable. In the exhibition of an exequatur, or other document in lieu thereof issued to a subordinate or substitute consular officer, such consular officer or such subordinate or substitute consular officer, as the case may be, shall be permitted to perform his duties and to enjoy the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities granted by this Convention.

4. Upon the death, incapacity, or absence of a consular officer having no subordinate consular officer at his post, secretaries or chancellors, whose official character may previously have been made known to the Government of the State in the territory of which the consular function was exercised, may temporarily exercise the consular functions of the deceased or incapacitated or absent consular officers; and while so acting shall enjoy all the rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities that were granted to the consular officer.

5. A consular officer or a diplomatic officer of either High Contracting Party, a national of the State by which he is appointed and duly commissioned or accredited by such State, may, in the capital of the other State, have the rank also of a diplomatic officer or of a consular officer, as the case may be, provided that and for so long as permission for him to exercise such dual functions has been duly granted by the Government of the State in the territory of which he exercises his functions as a consular officer and to which he is accredited as a diplomatic officer, and provided further that in any such case the rank as a diplomatic officer shall be under-

stood as being superior to and independent of the rank as a consular officer.

ARTICLE II

1. Consular officers, nationals of the State by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from arrest in such territory except when charged with the commission of an act designated by local legislation as crime other than misdemeanor and subjecting the individual guilty thereof to punishment by imprisonment. Such officers shall be exempt from military billeting, and from service of any military or naval, administrative or police character whatsoever.

2. In criminal cases the attendance at court by a consular officer as a witness may be demanded by the plaintiff, the defendant, or the judge. The demand shall be made with all possible regard for the consular dignity and the duties of the office; and there shall be compliance on the part of the consular officer.

3. In civil, contentious-administrative and labor cases, consular officers shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of the State which receives them. When the testimony of a consular officer who is a national of the State which appoints him and who is not engaged in any private occupation for gain is taken in civil cases, it shall be taken orally or in writing at his residence or office and with due regard for his convenience. The officer should, however, voluntarily give his testimony at the opportune moment of the trial whenever it is possible to do so without serious interference with his official duties.

4. A consular officer shall not be required to testify in criminal, contentious-administrative, labor or civil cases, regarding acts performed by him in his official capacity.

ARTICLE III

1. Consular officers and employees in a consulate, nationals of the State by which they are appointed, and not engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, shall be exempt from all taxes, National, State, provincial and municipal, including taxes on fees, wages or salaries received specifically in compensation for consular services, and they shall be exempt from all kinds of charges incident to the licensing, registration, use or circulation of vehicles. However, they shall not be exempt from taxes levied on account of the possession or ownership of immovable property situated within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions or taxes levied against income derived from property of any kind situated within such territory or belonging thereto.

2. The exemptions provided in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply equally to other officials who are duly appointed by one of the High Contracting Parties to exercise official functions in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, provided that such officials shall be nationals of the State appointing them and shall not be engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions; and provided further that permission for them to exercise such official functions has been duly granted by the Government of the receiving State. The Government of the State appointing such officials shall communicate to the Government of the receiving State satisfactory evidence of the appointment and shall indicate the character of the services which will be performed by the officials to whom the exemptions are intended to apply.

ARTICLE IV

1. Each High Contracting Party agrees to permit the entry free of all duty of all furni-

ture, equipment and supplies intended for official use in the consular offices of the other High Contracting Party, and to extend to such consular officers of the other High Contracting Party as are its nationals and to such members of their families and suites as are its nationals, the privilege of entry free of duty of their baggage and all other personal property whether accompanying the officer or his family or suite to his post or imported at any time during his incumbency thereof; provided, nevertheless, that there shall not be brought into the territories of either High Contracting Party any article, the importation of which is prohibited by the law of such High Contracting Party, until requirements in accordance with the appropriate law have been duly met.

2. The exemptions provided in paragraph 1 of this Article shall apply equally to other officials who are duly appointed by one of the High Contracting Parties to exercise official functions in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, provided that such officials shall be nationals of the State appointing them. The Government of the State appointing such officials shall communicate to the Government of the receiving State satisfactory evidence of the appointment and shall indicate the character of the services which are to be performed by the officials to whom the exemptions are intended to apply.

3. It is understood, however, that the exemptions provided in this Article shall not be extended to consular officers or other officials who are engaged in any private occupation for gain within the territory of the State to which they have been appointed or in which they exercise their functions, save with respect to Governmental supplies.

ARTICLE V

1. Consular officers may place over the outer door of their respective offices the arms of their State with an appropriate inscription designating the nature of the office, and they may place the coat of arms and fly the flag of their State on automobiles employed by them in the exercise of their consular functions. Such officers may also fly the flag of their State on their offices, including those situated in the capitals of the respective countries. They may likewise fly such flag over any boat or vessel employed in the exercise of the consular functions.

2. The quarters where consular business is conducted, correspondence to which the official seal of the consulates is affixed, and the archives of the consulate shall at all times be inviolable, and under no pretext shall any authorities of any character of the State in which such quarters or archives are located make any examination or seizure of papers or other property in such quarters or archives or to which the official seal is affixed. When consular officers are engaged in business within the territory of the State in which they exercise their functions, the files and documents of the consulate shall be kept in a place entirely separate from the place where private or business papers are kept. Consular offices shall not be used as places of asylum. No consular officers shall be required to produce official archives in court or to testify as to their contents.

ARTICLE VI

1. Consular officers of either High Contracting Party may, within their respective consular districts, address the authorities, National, State, Provincial or Municipal, for the purpose of protecting the nationals of the State by which they were appointed in the enjoyment of rights accruing by treaty or otherwise. Complaint may be made for the infraction of those rights. Failure upon the part of the proper authorities to grant redress or to accord protection may justify interposition through the diplomatic channel, and

in the absence of a diplomatic representative, a consul general or the consular officer stationed at the capital may apply directly to the Government of the country.

2. Consular officers shall, within their respective consular districts, have the right:

(a) to interview and communicate with the nationals of the State which appointed them;

(b) to inquire into any incidents which have occurred affecting the interests of the nationals of the State which appointed them;

(c) upon notification to the appropriate authority, to visit any of the nationals of the State which appointed them who are imprisoned or detained by authorities of the State; and

(d) to assist the nationals of the State which appointed them in proceedings before or relations with authorities of the State.

3. Nationals of either High Contracting Party shall have the right at all times to communicate with the consular officers of their country.

ARTICLE VII

1. Consular officers, in pursuance of the laws of their respective countries, may, within their respective districts:

(a) take and attest the depositions of any person whose identity they have duly established;

(b) authenticate signatures;

(c) draw up, attest, certify and authenticate unilateral acts, translations, testamentary dispositions, and transcripts of civil registry of the nationals of the State which has appointed the consular officer; and

(d) draw up, attest, certify and authenticate deeds, contracts, documents and written instruments of any kind, provided that such deeds, contracts, documents and written instruments shall have application, execution, and legal effect primarily in the territory of the State which shall have appointed the consular officer.

2. Instruments and documents thus executed and copies and translations thereof, when duly authenticated by the consular officer, under his official seal, shall be received as evidence in the territories of either State, as original documents or authenticated copies, as the case may be, and shall have the same force and effect as if drawn up or executed before a notary or other public officer duly authorized in the State by which the consular officer was appointed; provided, always, that such documents shall have been drawn and executed in conformity to the laws and regulations of the State where they are designed to take effect.

ARTICLE VIII

1. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, without having in the locality of his decease any known heirs or testamentary executors by him appointed, the competent local authorities shall at once inform the nearest consular officer of the State of which the deceased was a national of the fact of his death, in order that necessary information may be forwarded to the persons interested.

2. In case of the death of a national of either High Contracting Party in the territory of the other High Contracting Party, without will or testament whereby he has appointed testamentary executors, the consular officer of the State of which the deceased was a national and within whose district the deceased made his home at the time of death, shall, so far as the laws of the country permit and pending the appointment of an administrator and until letters of administration have been granted, be deemed qualified to take charge of the property left by the decedent for the preservation and protection of such property. Such consular officer shall have the right to be

appointed as administrator within the discretion of a court or other agency controlling the administration of estates, provided the laws of the place where the estate is administered so permit.

3. Whenever a consular officer accepts the office of administrator of the estate of a deceased countryman, he subjects himself in that capacity to the jurisdiction of the court or other agency making the appointment for all necessary purposes to the same extent as if he were a national of the State by which he has been received.

ARTICLE IX

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall within his district have the right to appear personally or by authorized representative in all matters concerning the administration and distribution of the estate of a deceased person under the jurisdiction of the local authorities, for all such heirs or legatees in the estate, either minors or adults, as may be nonresidents of the country and nationals of the State by which the consular officer was appointed, unless such heirs or legatees have appeared, either in person or by authorized representatives.

2. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party may on behalf of his non-resident countrymen collect and receipt for their distributive shares derived from estates in process of probate or accruing under the provisions of so-called Workmen's Compensation Laws or other like statutes, for transmission through channels prescribed by his Government to the proper distributees, provided that the court or other agency making distribution through him may require him to furnish reasonable evidence of the remission of the funds to the distributees.

ARTICLE X

1. A consular officer shall have exclusive jurisdiction over controversies arising out of the internal order of private vessels of his country, and shall alone exercise jurisdiction in situations, wherever arising, between officers and crews, pertaining to the enforcement of discipline on board, provided the vessel and the persons charged with wrongdoing shall have entered territorial waters or a port within his consular district. Consular officers shall also have jurisdiction over issues concerning the adjustment of wages and the execution of labor contracts of the crews; provided that their intervention will have a conciliatory character, without authority to settle disputes which may arise. This jurisdiction shall not exclude the jurisdiction conferred on the respective local authorities under existing or future laws of the place.

2. When an act committed on board a private vessel under the flag of the State by which the consular officer has been appointed and within the territory or the territorial waters of the State by which he has been received constitutes a crime according to the laws of the receiving State, subjecting the person guilty thereof to punishment as a criminal, the consular officer shall not exercise jurisdiction except in so far as he is permitted to do so by the local law.

3. A consular officer may freely invoke the assistance of the local police authorities in any matter pertaining to the maintenance of internal order on board a vessel under the flag of his country within the territory or the territorial waters of the State by which he has been received, and upon such request the requisite assistance shall be given.

4. A consular officer may appear with the officers and crews of vessels under the flag of his country before the judicial authorities of the State by which he has been received for the purpose of observing proceedings or of rendering assistance as an interpreter or agent.

ARTICLE XI

1. A consular officer of either High Contracting Party shall have the right to inspect within the ports of the other High Contracting Party within his consular district, the private vessels of any flag destined to and about to clear for ports of his country, for the sole purpose of observing the sanitary conditions and measures taken on board such vessels, in order that he may be enabled thereby to execute intelligently bills of health and other documents required by the laws of his country and to inform his Government concerning the extent to which its sanitary regulations have been observed at ports of departure by vessels destined to one of its ports, with a view to facilitating entry of such vessels, provided that the captain of the vessel shall have requested of the consular officer the issuance or visa of the appropriate bill of health.

2. In exercising the right conferred upon them by this Article, consular officers shall act with all possible despatch and without unnecessary delay.

ARTICLE XII

1. All proceedings relative to the salvage of vessels of either High Contracting Party wrecked upon the coasts of the other High Contracting Party shall be directed by the consular officer of the country to which the vessel belongs and within whose district the wreck may have occurred, or by some other person authorized for such purpose by the law of such country and whose identity shall be made known to the local authorities by the consular officer.

2. The local authorities of the receiving State shall immediately inform the consular officer, or the other authorized person to whom reference is made in the foregoing paragraph, of the occurrence, and shall in the meantime take all necessary measures for the protection of persons and the preservation of the wrecked property. Such authorities shall intervene only to maintain order, to protect the interests of the salvors, if the salvors do not belong to the crew of the wrecked vessel, and to ensure the execution of the arrangements which shall be made for the entry and exportation of the salvaged merchandise, such merchandise not to be subjected to any customs charges unless intended for subsequent consumption in the country where the wreck has occurred.

3. When the wreck occurs within a port, there shall be observed also those arrangements which may be ordered by the local authorities with a view to avoiding any damage that might otherwise be caused thereby to the port and to other ships.

4. The intervention of the local authorities shall occasion no expense of any kind to the owners or operators of the vessels, except such expenses as may be caused by the operations of salvage and the preservation of the goods saved, together with expenses that would be incurred under similar circumstances by vessels of the country.

ARTICLE XIII

Honorary Consuls or Vice Consuls, as the case may be, shall enjoy, in addition to all the rights, privileges, exemptions, immunities and obligations enjoyed by honorary consular officers of the same rank of the most favored nation, those rights, privileges, exemptions, immunities and obligations provided for in paragraph 3 of article I and in articles V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, and XII of the present Convention, for which they have received authority in conformity to the laws of the State by which they are appointed.

ARTICLE XIV

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in the City of Mexico.

The Convention shall take effect in all its provisions the thirtieth day after the day of the exchange of ratifications and shall continue in force for the term of five years.

2. If, six months before the expiration of the aforesaid period of five years, the Government of neither High Contracting Party shall have given notice to the Government of the other High Contracting Party of an intention of modifying by change or omission any of the provisions of any of the Articles of this Convention or of terminating the Convention upon the expiration of the aforesaid period of five years the Convention shall continue in effect after the aforesaid period and until six months from the date on which the Government of either High Contracting Party shall have notified to the Government of the other High Contracting Party an intention of modifying or terminating the Convention.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, in the City of Mexico, on this 12th day of the month of August, 1942.

G. S. MESSERSMITH [SEAL]
E. PADILLA [SEAL]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations very carefully considered the convention, and reported it favorably. I do not oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Mexico defining the duties, rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities of consular officers of each country in the territory of the other country, signed at Mexico City on August 12, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. (Putting the question.) Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now Foreign Service officers of class 7 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Fritz A. M. Alfsen, of New York.
Aubrey E. Lippincott, of Arizona.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Albert L. Nickerson, from the State of Massachusetts, to be Director, Bureau of Placement, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Denton O. Rushing, from the State of Arkansas, to be field supervisor, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Joseph Earl Smith, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Youngstown area office of the War Manpower Commission (vice Marion A. Gregg, transferred).

Lorentz E. Wormley, from the State of California, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Portland area office of the War Manpower Commission.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Evelyn C. Hunter, Neptune Beach, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

Mack B. Smith, Drybranch, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elvis L. Hopper, Hapeville, Ga., in place of W. R. Conline, resigned.

Stephen C. Tate, Tate, Ga., in place of Maynard Mashburn, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Webster Hanna, Noble, Ill., in place of G. G. Martin, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Carolyn V. Ducker, Butler, Ky., in place of C. O. Ducker, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Clinton C. Barron, Lillie, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MARYLAND

Mary Estelle Ennis, Joppa, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Patrick J. Connelly, Boston, Mass., in place of P. F. Tague, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Monroe Burton, Poteau, Okla., in place of Monroe Burton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Paul A. Mills, Woodburn, Oreg., in place of H. F. Butterfield, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Curtis L. Waller to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thurman W. Arnold to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER FROM THE INDICATED DATES

Leonard C. Johnson from March 1, 1943.

John Bowie, Jr., from March 1, 1943.

Ector B. Latham from March 1, 1943.

George R. Shelton from March 16, 1943.

Ira T. Sanders from March 24, 1943.

Edward R. McCarthy from March 24, 1943.

Francis B. Quinn from March 24, 1943.

Emil H. Kirsch from March 26, 1943.

LXXXIX—110

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Finance Department

First Lt. Percival Stanley Brown

To Air Corps

Second Lt. Leroy Hugh Watson, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Edward Augustus Coates, Jr.

James Albertus Bethea

Asa Margrave Lehman

Orauel Henry Stanley

Sewell Munson Corbett

Samuel Rely Norris

Benjamin Norris

To be captains, Medical Corps

David Paul Ward

Edwin Emmons Corcoran

To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Allen Chamberlain Wight

Elwood Luke Nye

CHAPLAINS

To be captains

Roger Dace Russell

John Frederick Gaertner

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS

To be second lieutenants

John F. Coffey

Andrew M. Zimmer

William F. Mazlack

Richard A. Kelly

Preston S. Marchant

Jackson C. Turnacliff

POSTMASTERS

MISSOURI

Morris D. Greenwood, Fredericktown.

John H. Dickbrader, Washington.

OKLAHOMA

William T. Gaddis, Catoosa.

WISCONSIN

Frances A. Hollister, Clinton.

George C. Smith, Downing.

William L. Lee, Drummond.

Alphonse J. McGuire, Highland.

Leone E. De Muth, Hollandale.

Letha G. Sherman, North Prairie.

Minnie O. Bartelme, Okauchee.

Louis H. Schultz, Reedsburg.

Grover E. Falck, Seymour.

Louis H. Rivard, Turtle Lake.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pray that we may love Thy ways with the full force of decision and purpose. In all crises let it be our settled aim to watch, lest any idol have dominion over us. Bestow upon us the spirit of devotion which shall prove that it is just and good to obey Thy laws as taught by our Saviour.

O Thou who wert the pilot of the Galilean Lake, the fountain of light of all our days, enable us to lift the galling burdens of grief and pain and hold high the torch of faith before the winding paths of clamor and strife. As we touch life's throng and press with its great

heart and yet with its greater heartache, lead us to apply the cooling balm to feverish pain and fear. Bless us with the spirit of humble service and cause us to follow in the ways of a beautiful humility and nobility of soul. Dear Lord, we wait at the altar; the times are nervously sensitive; we urgently pray that Thy servants may heed Thy word: "Wisdom resteth in the heart of him who hath understanding and the tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright." In the name of Him who manifested to the world the glory of deathless love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 19, 1943:

H. R. 1446. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes.

On March 2, 1943:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very interesting and timely article on lend-lease by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Maj. Gen. C. M. Wesson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. SNYDER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BREAD-SLICING BAN

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when the American housewife goes to the grocery today, she can again buy sliced bread as she bought it before the ban on bakery slicing was imposed by Food Distribution Administration Order No. 1 on January 18. As you know, Food Administrator Wickard rescinded the slicing ban yesterday.

Mr. Wickard deserves credit for acting with good Hoosier horse sense in this matter, and I want to be among the first to congratulate him. I am confident he was not responsible for the order in the

first place. I doubt if he ever had a true picture of the situation which this order created until the pressure of public protest finally broke through the screen of little planners and administrators who were originally responsible for the mistake.

As the House knows, I have been active in the fight which finally corrected this bit of bureaucratic bungling. Bakers and the operators of restaurants and hotels in my own State came to me in the matter when the order first went into effect. Since the fight started, the press associations, the newspapers, and the radio have all cooperated most generously with me and, as a result, have channeled an amazing volume of valuable evidence through my hands.

Housewives by the hundreds, bakers, paper experts, and packaging engineers from all parts of the country actually deserve the credit for this victory over bureaucracy. The American people documented this case against a bad piece of administration, and my only job has been to direct the weight of evidence as effectively as possible.

There is a clear lesson here which good administrators know, and which I hope the little dictators and political sadists will be forced to learn and observe: The American people will accept any sacrifice which they know to be necessary in the emergency. They definitely will not be conditioned for dictatorship by foolish and needless privations imposed for no better reason than to please little men's vanity and passion for administrative law. The sooner we can get that lesson across the more sure we can be that the many restrictive orders really vital to our war effort will not be jeopardized by the doubts, suspicions, and confusion which the little men in government have exhibited such a positive genius for creating.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the efficiency of his cutting remarks.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

I hope that heads of other executive departments and some of the bureau heads will do something about many other ridiculous, senseless orders and directives, so that the people may have more confidence in the administration of the war effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

THE FOOD SUPPLY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a table which I have prepared from the Department of Agriculture and from the Bureau of the Census, showing the percentage of food that is produced by each State and its relation to the population of that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a poem by E. O. Osborne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very heartening and encouraging telegram I have received from farm leaders of Boone County, a county in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in the first to include an address on Andrew Johnson, and in the other to include a newspaper article on William McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUSTRIAN BATTALION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business on Monday next I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include an editorial entitled "An American Charter," and in the other to include an editorial entitled "Russia and the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GEN. O. R. GELLETTE

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in these days of war, it is interesting to recite something of the interest and activity of one of the few remaining heroes of the Confederacy. I have just received a letter from Gen. O. R. Gellette, of Shreveport, La. I believe a word about this grand old soldier will be inspiring to all of us. He was 97 years old last September and is hale and hearty and takes an active interest in public questions and is active in furthering the war effort. He was with Stonewall Jackson when he was fatally wounded and is the last member of Gen. Robert E. Lee's staff. He recently rode 600 miles to pin the gold bars on his son, who was graduating from an officer candidate school and on the train he had to stand up 125 miles of the way.

The patriotism, stamina, and determination of this man nearly a hundred years old ought to spur all of us on to greater effort and sacrifice. At that great age he is on the job every day. This great southern leader is setting a worthy example of devotion to the cause of America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement covering our current tax situation by a thoughtful constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a supplemental list of names of farmers who have written me regarding the farm situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BREAD SLICING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether this order rescinding the order which prevented the slicing of bread in the bakeries is due to Mr. Wickard or due to the influence of Mr. Brown or Mr. Brown's wife—and they are both people of good sense and good judgment—I do not know, but one thing is sure: As this campaign for a fourth term develops, more and more of these restrictive orders are going to be liberalized, at least until after the next election in 1944, but in any event it is a good sign, and I am sure some 10,000,000 housewives will be glad to know this order which prohibited the slicing of bread at the bakeries has been rescinded. Has the President heard from the housewives?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial.

I also ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BIRTHDAY OF HON. SOL BLOOM

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House will be glad to know that today, while our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is handling this very important bill covering lend-lease, at the same time he is celebrating his seventy-third birthday. I want to join in congratulating him.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FACILITIES

[Mr. SHAFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Times-Herald of March 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a copy of an editorial from the Norwich Morning Bulletin of Saturday, February 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the O. P. A. to fix a ceiling price on industrial commodities where the cost of these commodities can be definitely determined and where their production is handled by a few companies. It is quite a different thing, where we need maximum food production, to fix a ceiling price on farm commodities. For in this case there are thousands of producers each working under different conditions, cost factors, and difficulties. I should like to offer a principle which I think is sound for the O. P. A. to use if ceiling prices are to be fixed on farm commodities. You cannot fix such prices on the basis of a tight calculation of what the average cost to the average farmer is going to be; it has got to be a real ceiling price; that is, a price high enough to give sufficient leeway so that the small farmer can live under it; otherwise the result of price control will be to drive some of the small producers to the wall and out of business. We cannot afford to let this happen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

MILITARY AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION TODAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, permission will be granted to this committee to sit this afternoon only during general debate on this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I so modify the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—
PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION
TODAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may be permitted to sit during the afternoon for such period only as general debate may be carried on.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, can the majority leader tell us the balance of the program for the week?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I am glad the gentleman from Michigan has made this inquiry.

On Friday after the disposition of the bill raising the debt limit a bill will be called up containing an appropriation in connection with the recruiting of manpower for farms and the distribution of farm labor involving I think about \$26,000,000. It is my intention to permit this bill to be brought up on Friday next.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may sit during the session of the House this afternoon only so long as general debate on the lend-lease bill may continue?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include an article on the appointment of Lyle Watts as Chief Forester.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the March issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association protesting against the transfer of the Meat Inspection Division.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A. A. A. THREATS AND COERCION

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received several letters from farmers in my district who are not conforming with the A. A. A. program. These farmers allege that the triple A agents have threatened to close them out if they refuse to sign up for the 1943 program. In speaking of program I do not mean the program for food production for the war effort, but some of the established programs of the A. A. A.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I should like to say to the gentleman and the House that I have letters from Wabash County farmers saying they, too, have been denied farm equipment because they are not cooperating with the triple-A program. I think this action on the part of the triple A is reprehensible.

Mr. GILLIE. That is right. The same thing is going on in my district.

I am inserting an exchange of correspondence between myself and Mr. Fred S. Wallace, Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Department of Agriculture, regarding this situation and stating that noncomplying farmers do not have to sign up in order to get repairs or new machinery to carry on their work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks; and to extend my remarks and include the letter I referred to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter written by a close personal friend of mine, a constituent, who is now in the Navy. This letter shows what the boys are thinking, when they are fighting, about our present post-war problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include a couple of short articles from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]?

There was no objection.

**AMENDMENT TO ORGANIC LAW OF
PUERTO RICO (H. DOC. NO. 126)**

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Several months ago the Governor of Puerto Rico recommended that the organic law of Puerto Rico be amended so as to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor. This recommendation was brought to me by the Secretary of the Interior with his approval. The Governor's suggestion has been under consideration since that time.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its Territories and island possessions.

Puerto Rico has universal suffrage and an elective legislature which considers and enacts measures governing its internal affairs. Laws enacted by its legislature, however, including laws of purely local concern, have been subject to approval or disapproval by Governors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

In accordance with the general policy of this Government, I recommend to the Congress that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor, and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and the government of Puerto Rico, respectively.

I have appointed a committee composed of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and of continental residents to advise me concerning changes in the organic law.

The recommendations of this committee will be promptly submitted to the Congress for its consideration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, March 9, 1943.

AMENDING LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement to the Members that on the desk there is an index to the testimony of the hearings on the bill H. R. 1501. This is something new that has never been done before. You will find in this index reference to the page of testimony of all of the witnesses who appeared for the Government with reference to the bill that we have under consideration, H. R. 1501. I would advise the Members to get one of these, then they will be able to refer to the hearings very easily and find out all about the testimony.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1501) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1501, with **Mr. GORE** in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the statement attributed yesterday to Admiral Standley, our Ambassador to Russia, to my mind is a very unfortunate one, if he made it. If he made the statement and it is correctly reported in the papers, the facts do not bear it out. The facts are that no one in the executive branch of the Government knew anything about the statement Ambassador Standley made. I am informed that they were not consulted in any way. It was a great surprise to them, and I guess it was to all of us, that this statement should be chronicled in the papers over here.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman in the remarks he is now making speak with authority for the executive departments and for the administration in reference to this very vital foreign affairs matter?

Mr. BLOOM. The information I am about to give to the committee at this time is information I received from the departments from which such information would come. I did consult with the State Department this morning and asked them if they knew anything about this statement. They said "No." So I am not representing the State Department. Although this is my birthday, I think I am still chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and I speak just in that capacity. I would prefer to make my statement, and then if there are any questions to be asked I would be very glad to answer them.

Mr. MICHENER. The real thing I am interested in is whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished Member from New York [**Mr. BLOOM**], even though it is his birthday, is speaking for the administration. This is important because his words as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs uttered in the debate on this vital foreign affairs legislation will be carried not only throughout the length and breadth of this country but throughout the world.

Mr. BLOOM. I hope they will be. I will stand on anything I say on this floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan has asked a very pertinent and proper question, and I think it deals with a matter that should be clearly understood. In order to clarify the situation, as I understand, the gentleman has made his own investigation and the remarks he is now about to make are his own personal remarks?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is not expressing the views of the State Department or the administration but is stating his own personal views?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. That answers my question.

Mr. BLOOM. The Russian press has told the people of Russia something about the lend-lease aid supplied to Russia by the United Kingdom and the United States. Thus, for example, the New York Times, on January 24, 1943, reported that Pravda, one of the leading newspapers of the Soviet Union, contained a news item about the planes, tanks, motor vehicles, and so forth, supplied to the Soviet by the British and ourselves.

The people of Russia, seeing and using a great multitude of United States and British lend-lease supplies, must, of necessity, know of the lend-lease aid which has been supplied to Russia.

On this point, I think that it is of interest to note a recent news story by Henry Cassidy, who was head of the Associated Press Bureau in Moscow. This report by Mr. Cassidy clearly indicates that the people of Soviet Russia not only know of but appreciate the supplies which have been sent to them under lend-lease. The full report of Mr. Cassidy's article which appeared in the New York Times of March 6 indicates that the people of Russia know a good deal about the lend-lease aid which is getting to them. Mr. Cassidy also had a piece in the February 28, 1943, issue of the Washington Star which points up substantially the same facts about the knowledge of the Russian people on lend-lease aid.

The Russian newspapers generally report in full the speeches of the President and of Prime Minister Churchill. Many of these speeches refer to the lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union.

Up to March 1, 1943, the United States had sent 3,250,000 tons of lend-lease supplies to Russia. These supplies covered such a great variety of items of such distinctly American type that the Soviet soldiers and people know they are coming from this country. We have sent to Russia more than 2,600 airplanes; more than 3,000 tanks; more than 130,000 sub-machine guns; about 90,000 jeeps, armored cars and other military vehicles; hundreds of thousands of field telephones; thousands of miles of field telephone wire and 580,000 tons of steel and steel products.

We have also sent them American motorcycles, gas-driven generators, chemicals and chemical products, Army boots and sole leather, and other industrial products.

Large quantities of American food have been sent to Russia. Much of it indicates in various ways to the Soviet Army and people that this food has come from this country.

May I say at this point that the American food that is sent to Russia bears, wherever possible, a picture of the American flag on each individual package and it is natural to suppose that the soldiers and the other people at the front who

get these packages know where they come from.

There can be little doubt that in many different ways the soldiers and people of the Soviet Union know a good deal about the lend-lease supplies which have been made available to them.

Mr. Chairman, the following article by Henry C. Cassidy appeared in the New York Times on March 6, 1943:

**SOVIET OFFENSIVE IS SPEEDED BY BIG
AMERICAN SUPPLIES**
(By Henry C. Cassidy)

The United States, despite all Adolf Hitler can do to stop it, is definitely delivering the goods to the Soviet Union. After riding in American trucks and jeeps, seeing American bombers and fighters, eating American sugar and lard in remote corners of Russia, one cannot doubt that a large part of the supplies we promised the Red army is reaching its destination.

I cannot cite figures. The only ones made known in Moscow are those announced from Washington or London. But I can tell you the impression of one who has been in Russia throughout the war.

It is that the answer is "Yes" to the questions: Are American goods reaching the Soviet Union? Are the Russians satisfied with our supplies?

Herr Hitler, early in the war, boasted that the United Nations' only supply lines to the Soviet Union were across the Arctic or along the Equator. Since then he has certainly been surprised by the way those very lines have been made effective.

Our most conspicuous contribution to the Soviet war effort is in vehicles. On the main streets of Moscow, on the roads of provincial towns, on the dirt tracks of the countryside, American trucks are a common sight. Jeeps scuttle everywhere, from the paved highways of the rear to the rough fields of the front.

A year ago they were rare sights, which caused onlookers to stop and admire them. Now they are no longer a novelty.

The trucks are used for road transport on which the Red army depends largely for its supplies. The jeeps are used as staff cars to carry officers on their missions. Both have been employed extensively in the Russian winter offensive.

Some trucks have suffered broken axles on trackless terrain, boiled over in summer, frozen in winter; some jeep motors have become clogged with mud; but, generally, men who drive the machines have told me their performance has been splendid.

The Russians are good, resourceful mechanics. Machines get rough treatment in that rigorous climate. But with a minimum of tools and spare parts the drivers keep them running.

Pavel Ivanovich Diakoff, an average Russian chauffeur who drives a light American sedan for the Associated Press, had to park his car out of doors in Kuibyshev all last winter, in 40-below-zero temperatures, and several feet of snow. But each morning, when the telegrams were ready to go, so was the car.

American tanks are assembled deep in the rear and sent directly to the front. The first M-3 models, with a riveted frame and fixed cannon, proved less effective than the welded types and mobile turret, but since then more modern machines have been delivered.

The Russians still prefer their heavy Kv, medium T-34, and light T-60 tanks for major combat. They used these principally in their southern offensives this winter, but American and British tanks are doing service on other fronts.

UNITED STATES PLANES ON FRONTS

American fighters, the Tomahawk, Kittyhawk, and Airacobra, are defending some of

the most important points of the Soviet Union, including Moscow, Leningrad and Murmansk. Crack pilots, many of them wearers of the highest decoration, Hero of the Soviet Union, are flying them. Unanimously, they like them.

I have seen these at airports outside Moscow. They have had little to do there recently, for the Germans have not raided the capital since last April 5, that, in itself, is a strong recommendation of their efficiency.

American attack bombers have not been on public display, but they are reliably reported to have been used effectively during the defense of Stalingrad and the Red army counter-offensive.

It may be a prod to American pride to note that the Russians believe they have fighters, as well as tanks, superior to anything we have delivered to the Soviet Union. A foreign pilot, who has flown American, British, and Soviet planes and who is now fighting on the Russian front, told me he agreed the Red air force Yak was better than anything else he had handled.

I have come across numerous other items of American supplies: Field telephones with a Cossack unit, woolen blankets in a military hospital, granulated sugar in a Red army mess, lard on the shelves of a Moscow store, all of it being given good use.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I agree with what the chairman of our committee has said. Ambassadors, like Congressmen, sometimes talk out of turn and talk too much.

In addition to what the gentleman has said with reference to Pravda being one of the leading newspapers of Russia, may I say that I understand it is the official organ of the Soviet Republic.

Mr. BLOOM. I believe it is, yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. On the 23d of January Pravda carried a report quoting from figures given by Mr. Stettinius as to the aid given to Russia and others of our allies.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; that is very true. After Mr. Stettinius, the Lend-Lease Administrator, issued his statement on lend-lease aid to Russia, Pravda, a Russian newspaper, the largest newspaper over there—I will not say it is an official newspaper because it may not be that—published the complete statement of Mr. Stettinius. We have evidence of that over here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. The statement of our Ambassador to Russia gave correctly the facts as to the amount and kind of help we have been sending to Russia?

Mr. BLOOM. We do not know just what Ambassador Standley did say. We know he is supposed to have made that statement, but we have not had any official report from Moscow to the State Department that the Ambassador made the remarks that have been reported in the press.

Mr. EATON. The list printed in the newspapers and attributed to him is a correct list?

Mr. BLOOM. We do not know just what he did say.

Mr. EATON. The only question is as to the propriety of our Ambassador making the further statement that the people of Russia were not acquainted with the facts regarding the help being extended?

Mr. BLOOM. If he did make the statement, it is very unfortunate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever weapons of war we are sending to any countries united with us are to help defeat the common enemy?

Mr. BLOOM. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. I wonder if the figures the gentleman has given us in regard to the aid sent to Russia are figures of the amount actually received by Mr. Stalin, or by Russia, or are they figures of the amount we have shipped from our ports. Mr. Stalin said that he has not received any.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, there is no question about that—he did not say that.

Mr. WILSON. I mean that our Ambassador said that.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, I do not know what the Ambassador said.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. FISH. It seems to me to be very clear that the Ambassador is reported as having said that the Russian newspapers—the Russian press—had suppressed the information that we had given this vast amount of aid—lend-lease aid—to Russia. That is what the Ambassador is reported to have said.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not read the word "suppressed."

Mr. FISH. That is the word that he used. It was "suppressed." That was carried by all of the newspapers. Does the gentleman want to repudiate our Ambassador?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. The gentleman from New York surely does not want to put any words like that into my mouth. I said it is a very unfortunate thing. We do not know what he said, or whether he said anything. We have no official report except what the press said. If he did say it, it is an unfortunate statement for our Ambassador to make because the facts do not warrant such a statement.

Mr. FISH. If Ambassador Standley stated the truth, we want to know about it, do we not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman take another minute?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. I yield myself another minute.

Mr. CASE. The thing that amazes me about the whole incident is that apparently some people in this country can tell more about what the Russian Government is undertaking to tell its people than Ambassador Standley can, who is on the ground, and it seems to me that in the interest of the facts, it would be well to restrain all comment, until we have a report from Admiral Standley and the Government, of what he said.

Mr. BLOOM. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLOOM. My time is exhausted.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman from New Jersey give me 1 minute?

Mr. EATON. Time is very precious, and I hope the gentleman will control himself for a while.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hope I shall not disappoint any of my colleagues in the House when I say that I do not care to discuss the Standley statement. I know nothing about it, although I am very anxious to know about it. However, for the moment I think it wise that we do not add any fuel to a potential fire.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was debated very comprehensively yesterday. The purpose of the act was made plain, and to a very large degree the methods of its operation were explained. I doubt very much if I can add much to what has been said. Perhaps you will bear with me if I try to fill in a few of the chinks, as it were, which may involve my hopping about from one point of the earth's surface to another, endeavoring to complete the painting of a picture which was so nearly painted yesterday. Before I do that let me make another preliminary announcement. That is, I do not care what a man thought about this bill back in 1941, not one little bit. Some may have disagreed with me at that time, and I may have disagreed with them. The important thing is to know what we feel about it now, and that is all there is to it. So I am not going to torture that subject. As to the operation of lend-lease, I dislike that name. I wish it were called "war aid," because lend-lease is not an adequate description of what we are doing.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I heard a suggestion overnight that struck me as very good, and that is to call it mutual war aid.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Good enough. Excellent. Let us cast our eyes for a few moments toward Great Britain. Two years ago, as you all know, Great Britain was terribly hard put to it. She had suffered the Dunkerque disaster, in which she lost practically all of her modern

equipment, such as it was, and it turned out that it really was not modern at that. She was in desperate straits. She had to struggle hard to get back on her feet, faced with the possibility and, indeed, to the average Britisher, the probability of invasion at any moment.

She had to start from the ground up, so to speak, in the production of modern equipment for war. Fortunately for herself she possessed in the R. A. F. an amazingly efficient instrument, small though it was; and perhaps history will relate, and I think it will, that the R. A. F. had more to do with repelling invasion or discouraging the enemy from attempting it than all of the other elements in Great Britain and the British Empire together. So that starting from that point and continuing for something like 2 years, the amount of aid which we have given to Great Britain under this act has been very important. Up to December 31 last it amounted in round figures, measured at dollar value, to \$4,000,000,000. Most of it consisted of tanks, airplanes, spare parts for both, machine tools, ammunition—heavy stuff. Not all of it was sent to Great Britain. A considerable portion was sent clear around the Cape of Good Hope to the Red Sea and landed in Egypt in a desperate attempt to strengthen the British defense against the then conquering Rommel. A terrific decision had to be made at that time by the joint chiefs of staff, a decision as to whether or not Great Britain, with the help of such weapons as we could send—we were not at the time able to send much personnel—should attempt to defend the Middle East. If she could not do it, then our war would obviously be lengthened Lord knows how long. But the decision was made and we sent tanks—Grants, Shermans, and Stuarts—as fast as we could, around the Cape of Good Hope—a long, long voyage. We sent some repair crews and repair machinery; generally speaking, the weapons themselves were manned by the British and New Zealand and Australian troops in the actual battles.

What the military historian will say about it in the future I am not certain, but I think it fair to approach the conclusion, at least, that our contribution of these weapons was an important element in enabling the British to defeat Rommel. Those weapons also included airplanes, light bombers, and P-40's and Aircobras. I think we are entitled to approach the conclusion that those weapons placed in the hands of the British fighting men, contributed to the saving of the Middle East and the ultimate defeat of Rommel, although most of the equipment used in Montgomery's army was British.

Great Britain in the meantime has been built up, by the efforts of the British people and ourselves, into the greatest military base of all time. Never has there been anything like it. We are sending more and more troops of all categories. Airports dot the islands. I have been told that in some places in Great Britain you can scarcely drive 5 miles without encountering an airport. The

contributions which we are making now under this act to Great Britain, and which we shall continue to make, will be less of the heavy material—tanks, trucks, machine tools, steel, and things of that sort, because, with our help, the British production has come up to the point where it balances the available British manpower, which incidentally, I may say at this point, has been wonderfully distributed—distributed in orderly and systematic fashion. We shall continue to send food. It might be interesting to you to know that before the war the British people were accustomed to raise about 40 percent of their food on the island, but since the war, again by orderly and systematic distribution of manpower, Great Britain has increased her tillable acreage from 12,000,000 acres to 18,000,000 acres and is now producing 60 percent of her own food supply. We are contributing 10 percent under this act. There is a total of 70 percent. The remaining 30 percent comes largely from Canada, other British dominions, and South America.

I may remind you that Canada, as an outright gift to Great Britain, contributed a billion dollars' worth of supplies, mostly food. There is a bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament which if passed, and in all probability it will pass, appropriates an additional billion dollars as an outright gift. It is their type of so-called lend-lease. They do not denominate it by that term. So, apparently the food problem has been pretty well solved, although we know that those people are reduced to a very severe ration.

Now, reverting again to the airports. Ordinarily lend-lease has not engaged in the building of airports anywhere, but there are certain very few exceptions. It was found wise at the beginning of these operations or shortly after its beginning, to build certain airports with lend-lease funds as a part of the necessary military defense of certain naval stations. One of them is in northern Ireland, a naval station used by our vessels and our naval convoy vessels, as well as the British; a couple, as I understand it, at similar places in Scotland. None of those two or three airports have any conveniences for civilian flying, and they are not expected to be of any commercial use when the war is over. They are meant to be a part of the defense of those naval stations. All other airports in Britain are built by the British themselves. The ports that our Army Air Corps use are all built by British under reverse lend-lease. The land is acquired either by purchase or rental, the land is leveled off by British labor, the runways built, the hangars, the repair shops, the quarters for troops are erected at British expense. Officers quarters are found on the post or in private dwellings nearby at no expense to the officers in the way of rental.

Those airports, as well as other cantonments built by the British, in which our troops are housed, are also serviced by them. By that I mean they are equipped with adequate water supply, with sewage disposal, with telephone and

telegraph service, free of charge—as well as electric power and light. My recollection for example, is that in order to let our people get to work quicker and organize our expeditionary forces which eventually must leave Great Britain for fields of battle—and some of them have already left for north Africa—13 hotels were turned over for the headquarters of our commands or quarters of the officers, I assume, and for other purposes, free of charge, serviced completely.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] yesterday did his best to estimate the value of the articles and the construction paid for by the British and used by our people in Great Britain. I think he made a pretty close estimate—fairly close. It is almost impossible to get it exactly. We have asked Mr. Stettinius for it. One of the troubles is that the item of service is exceedingly difficult to keep track of, such as how many telegrams are sent, how many telephone calls and how many telegraph messages are put through, how much free railroad transportation for all American military personnel traveling on duty. It is extremely hard to keep up with that. We are informed, however, that the British Government is keeping tab, as best it can, on the quantity of articles turned over and the quantity of construction achieved, and as best it can the value, if the value can even be arrived at, of the services furnished. The construction item is pretty well known, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], I think, stated yesterday that the British have expended on construction for our troops five-hundred-and-sixty-million-odd dollars. Then, of course, in addition to that, there are certain items of food that are recited in our report, of transportation, and of the services to which I have referred, which would have to be calculated at a later date, because the thing is running along so fast that it is almost impossible for either the American officers or British officers to keep track of and render a real account.

I think I am not violating any confidence when I say that the Administrator of this act tells me that in accordance with their best calculations and their intimate cooperation with the British, that the British contribution to us under lend-lease is now crowding \$1,000,000,000 in value, as contrasted with the \$400,000,000 that we have extended to them. That contribution from the British is apt to grow as the number of troops in Great Britain grows, and our contribution of heavy articles, such as tanks and machine tools, is apt to decrease as time goes on. Whether British contribution will ever become as great as ours is a great question; probably it will not in Great Britain alone, but I thought you would not mind my giving you that picture of the situation.

I think I ought to emphasize this: This act has a military objective, not just relief; military considerations come first in its administration. Every bit of military supply that goes out as a result of this act to our allies is approved by military authorities of the United States.

The decisions reached by the Munitions Assignment Board and by the joint Chiefs of Staff have been reached with unanimity because apparently they think alike concerning the military necessities the world over.

For example, there was no hesitation in reaching a decision to send those tanks to Egypt to help save the Middle East, and there was no objection whatsoever by our military people when the British said to us: "Why do you ship field artillery guns across the Atlantic to England and so use American ship tonnage when we have field artillery guns just as good right here, guns which your men can use?" Our combat divisions now operating in north Africa—that is those which sailed from England—are armed with British 25-pounders which were turned over to us for use. It is just an example of what I regard as perfect cooperation. Listening to Mr. Stettinius and the other witnesses I got the impression—and I think the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee got the impression—that this was the first time in history, at least in written history, where allies seemed to be getting along together. I can remember the horrible quarrels between the Allies in World War No. 1, the quarrels in London between the Americans and the British, and the quarrels in France between the Americans, the French, and the British—terrible uproars because we had not evolved in that war a scheme by which it was understood from the beginning that each fellow would put in all he could put in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 20 additional minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. It is not clear to me whether this board on which Allied officers sit has any part in the determination for instance of what supplies we shall send to our men in the Pacific.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the broader sense, yes; because it is one great war, but our military people are in control absolutely of what we do with our own weapons. If they reach the conclusion that we should send a weapon to one of our allies who is on the spot and can use it, that it will not hurt the prospects of an American effort in another area, that weapon goes to that ally. Men like General Marshall and his ilk in the last analysis make those decisions. Mr. Stettinius, if I may use this expression, obeys orders.

Now we will go to north Africa and look into that situation. As you probably know, Algeria and Morocco are potentially great food-producing areas. It so happens I have traveled in them somewhat, and as a result of it, I can say to my friends in the Middle West, that never have I seen more lovely farms than I saw on the Algerian coastal plains and in some of the valleys in the mountains; but for 2 years the German and Italian armistice commissions have squeezed that whole region dry. They not

only took away from all that was left of the French Army, 150,000 men, all its modern equipment, but they took away from the civilian population nearly all the food under the pretense of sending it to France, but when it got to Marseilles it went from Marseilles to Germany with the result that in north Africa there is a very serious shortage of food amongst the native population.

Now, who decides as to what lend-lease shall do in helping that expeditionary force in north Africa? The man's name is Eisenhower; he commands the entire expedition, British, American, and French. He and his staff decide what lend-lease can do to help him drive the Germans out of Africa. He may need help which at first blush does not seem to resemble anything in the military line, but when Eisenhower has to calculate all the possibilities in that situation and take into his calculation the condition of the native population which for our own advantage must be kept in a contented state lest there be food riots or sabotage, General Eisenhower might very well say to lend-lease: "In addition to other supplies send some food, send some candy, if you please." Candy was sent. Some very interesting testimony came before us. There happened to be some spare space in one or two of the ships that took our expedition from the United States to north Africa and on the recommendation of the high command in north Africa, or the high command which was on its way to north Africa at the time, that spare space was filled with funny little supplies for civilians. I believe you will find it to be a fact that when our troops waded ashore through the surf on some of those beaches and ran into a lot of Arabs they gave them a piece of candy and said, "Come on, boys, help us unload this surfboat," and they did it.

Little things like that have a military objective, although some people might ask, "Why candy?" It was a tiny little thing and I should not spend so much time referring to it, but it is typical of some of the things that must be done when you are fighting a war of this kind. In any event, nothing is sent by lend-lease to north Africa except on the request of General Eisenhower, and his request, of course, is reviewed by the Joint Assignment Board here in Washington to see, first, if the goods are available. If they are available they go; Eisenhower gets them and uses them primarily to drive the Germans out of north Africa.

Let us hop down to the southwest Pacific and take a look at New Zealand. My best recollection is that New Zealand contains about 2,000,000 people. It is an agricultural country. Our report contains a statement as to the amount of food which New Zealand turned over free of charge to our military personnel, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. It is rather amazing. If they keep it up at this rate and we ever strike a dollar balance, we may owe New Zealand rather than New Zealand owing us. Their output is largely dairy products, mutton, and beef.

Since 1939 they have at their own expense built 6 airports and enlarged 12 others for military use. I saw a dispatch in the press some days ago to the effect that New Zealand had built 103 airports in her own 2 little islands and was going to charge that up to us. The statement was made that such a number of airports was absurd and that they were building up a large bill against the United States. We find that these 103 airports existed in New Zealand before September 1939, and that probably the overwhelming majority of the others were small emergency landing fields.

New Zealand has built quarters and storage houses. What their total expenditures have been so far I do not know.

Now, we will cross a stretch of sea and go over to Australia. Here is a dispatch from Canberra, the capital of Australia, announcing the intention of the Australian Government under the lend-lease program. It was announced by the Prime Minister, John A. Beasley, on March 3 that Australia had accepted the responsibility of feeding United States forces in that country and throughout the south and southwest areas, and he stated further he had authorized the purchase of \$54,000,000 worth of provisions.

He declared the armed forces in the southwest Pacific, which includes the troops in the Solomons, New Guinea, and other islands, had food reserves to meet any war situation.

This article further states:

Australia will spend \$220,000,000 during the current financial year under a lease-lend arrangement to maintain United States forces, J. B. Chifley, Finance Minister, told Parliament.

He said that up to January 1, \$110,180,000 had been spent in the Australian program of providing airdromes, camp and hospital accommodations, rations, repairs for aircraft, ships, and vehicles, general supplies, seaport services, and rail, air, and sea transportation.

They have spent already \$110,000,000, they propose to spend \$220,000,000, which makes a total of \$330,000,000—this from a country with only 7,000,000 people, about the population of the city of New York.

In talking with Mr. Stettinius he ventured the suggestion that perhaps if we ever struck a dollar balance between ourselves and Australia we might eventually be owing them money instead of their owing us. I may be talking out of turn and perhaps not all of you will agree with me, but I am not concerned about striking a balance on any of these things. We are all in this fight together. You can see by this that Australia and New Zealand are giving everything they can to help win this war and we are giving everything we can and we are going to give more. That is the way this thing is working. Of course, our contribution measured in dollars is going to be larger, a great deal larger perhaps, than our total receipts.

Reference has been made to our contribution to Russia. The British contributed also. We sent 3,000 planes and 2,500 tanks. During the months of December 1942 and January 1943 not a

transport was lost between here and Murmansk. We are getting the goods to them. We may lose some cargo ships and transports. I do not mean to say that the submarine menace is not serious, because it is, but we are getting the goods to them. We are sending more food to Russia than we are to Great Britain and, according to Mr. Stettinius, nearly all of it goes to the Russian Army, not to the Russian civilian population. I suspect it did that Army some good, and, if it did, I am glad. It put out of business an awful lot of Germans.

Great Britain, I think, sent something like 2,500 planes and about 2,000 tanks in the same kind of partnership agreement. So by contrast with our previous experiences dating back many, many decades, I think we as an ally engaged in a war being waged to save ultimately our own liberty are fortunate under this act, and I think our allies are likewise fortunate.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. In the beginning of the gentleman's statement he mentioned the amount of money thus far appropriated in dollars and cents that we have furnished Great Britain; \$4,000,000,000, I believe it was.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is \$3,950,000,000. I called it in round figures \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. RIZLEY. Could the gentleman put in the Record the amount that we furnished to all of our allies in lend-lease funds?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot itemize it at this time, but the testimony, as I understand it and as I recollect—and some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will correct me if I am wrong—is to the effect that we have spent something like nine or ten billion dollars, \$4,000,000,000 of which has gone to Great Britain and to some of her outlying areas.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman will correct me if I am wrong about this. As I recall, we have appropriated thus far for lend-lease about \$66,000,000,000, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not appropriated that sum. My understanding is it has been authorized.

Mr. RIZLEY. Authorized and appropriated?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the total sum authorized I think is approximately \$70,000,000,000, but up to January 1 our actual expenditures were in the neighborhood of \$10,000,000,000. They are expected to be larger during this coming year, but not to reach \$66,000,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will yield, I can give the exact figures.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BLOOM. The appropriations made direct to lend-lease up to date are \$18,397,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is actual appropriations.

Mr. BLOOM. That is the appropriations. The allocations as of January 1, 1943, are \$16,675,853,000. The obliga-

tions as of January 1, 1943, are \$13,194,982,000. The expenditures as of January 1, 1943, are \$9,013,668,000. So the gentleman is pretty close in his estimate.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the best source of information in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma is the report of January 25 of this year by the Lend-Lease Administrator, Mr. Stettinius. On page 64 of that report he sets forth precisely the amount of money that has been appropriated or spent.

Lend-lease appropriations to the President—that is an appropriation—are \$18,410,000,000.

Transfers authorized from other appropriations, which also have been appropriated, of course, or they could not be transferred, \$35,970,000,000.

Value of ships which may be leased and ships built from earlier appropriations, approximately \$8,000,000,000.

This represents a total that has been appropriated so far under lend-lease of a little over \$63,000,000,000. That is actually appropriated.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the point on which I am not clear. Do I correctly understand that we have appropriated, according to the statement there, including these transfers, about \$63,000,000,000 up to date for lend-lease?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We did not make all the appropriations for lend-lease. Some of those appropriations were made to the emergency fund of the President. It turns out that he has used some of that money for lend-lease purposes.

Mr. RIZLEY. What I should like to have the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs put in the Record is information as to who has received that \$63,000,000,000, so that we can keep the Record straight as we go. Great Britain, as I understand, has received \$4,000,000,000. To whom has the other \$59,000,000,000 gone?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has not been spent.

Mr. RIZLEY. It has not yet been spent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. By no means.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then is it a fair statement to say that we will not need to expect any additional appropriations for the purpose of carrying out this act within the next few months or the next year?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not competent to say as to that. I have not seen the Budget estimate. Our committee examined the purposes of the act and its operation. What the Budget is asking I do not know.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman speaks of the amount Great Britain received. That possibly is not quite accurate. The United Kingdom received \$3,959,950,000 and the other members of

the British Commonwealth of Nations received \$2,393,193,000, a total of \$6,353,143,000, according to the lend-lease report furnished by Mr. Stettinius. Since then the amounts have increased. I thought the gentleman would probably want to explain that by Great Britain he meant the United Kingdom.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I did.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has made a very splendid statement showing the military significance of the lend-lease program. May I ask the gentleman, however, about another proposition in connection with it?

Certain high officials in the State Department say we are going to undertake to feed between 350,000,000 and 500,000,000 people outside the United States. We are having a growing scarcity of food in this country, as the gentleman knows. I am just wondering if this program of feeding these 350,000,000 or 500,000,000 people outside this country is to be taken out of this \$63,000,000,000, or how will it be handled.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman referring to an after-the-war period?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Under Secretary who made the statement said it was going to be done under lend-lease, and also in the post-war period.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can only express my personal opinion about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman's personal opinion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think it was the intent of the Congress when we passed this act in 1941 or that it is our present intent or the intent of the administration of lend-lease that Lend-Lease shall become an agent for the feeding of the people of the world after this war is over.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then somebody is giving a wrong impression, that we are going to act as Santa Claus for the entire world and bring them up to our standard of living.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is some very extensive dreaming going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, with our country engaged in war, fighting for its existence, it is unthinkable that the Congress of the United States will refuse to extend for 1 year the so-called Lend-Lease Act, under which authority we are furnishing our allies arms with which to defeat our enemies.

Two years ago, when we passed the original act, our country was not an active belligerent, and there may have been some reason then for difference of opinion as to the necessity for its passage—candidly it is difficult for me even now to appreciate the viewpoint of those who then opposed it—but I am not going to

argue with them now; we are dealing with the present, not the past. We are in the middle of a war today, the greatest the world has ever known, and we must win it. The stakes are too great to take any chances. The destiny of mankind and civilization—aye, the preservation of our own Republic, hangs in the balance.

It is no wonder then that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, composed of 25 Members of this body—14 Democrats and 11 Republicans—after an exhaustive hearing covering nearly 4 weeks, and a searching cross-examination of all the witnesses who were examined, reached the conclusion that the part of wisdom required and the defense of the country demanded that H. R. 1501 should pass, and they so recommended unanimously, without a dissenting vote, and the bill is before you for your action, backed by the composite judgment of that committee.

It would seem unnecessary for any extended debate upon an issue so simple and about which there should be no controversy. Our committee was deeply impressed with the able and efficient manner in which the act had been administered by Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., the Administrator, and his staff, including Mr. Oscar Cox, the general counsel, both of whom attended the hearings daily and were most helpful in furnishing all information desired by any member of the committee. They were frank, candid, and anxious to supply the committee with all of the facts pertaining to its operation, and they evinced a personal and not a second-hand knowledge of what had been done. I doubt whether any department of the Government has ever been more ably or efficiently administered, and I think this statement reflects, not only my personal views, but those of the entire membership of our committee. I wish the entire membership of the House could have sat in on the hearings on this bill, and I believe if they had, not a single vote would be recorded against its passage.

I am gratified at the vast volume of supplies we have furnished to our allies in such a short time, and am surprised and pleased to know of the aid and material assistance that have been given us by our allies under its operation. Truly, lend-lease is not a one-way street.

The hearings and the report contain these in retail, and I assume that you have read them. If not, you should do so.

Further, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who has just addressed us, has given the facts and figures with reference to these contributions by our allies, and I shall not detain you by repeating them now.

While, of course, we have, insofar as material values are concerned, contributed a vastly larger proportion than we have received, this we expected to do, and should do, both because our material resources are greater and our country has not been invaded and our productive capacity impaired. Their factories and plants, their railroads, their business houses, their churches and homes, to-

gether with thousands of their men, women, and little children, have been liquidated and destroyed by the enemy. But they have not given up, but have continued to carry on with brave hearts and indomitable wills worthy of a great people and in a manner to challenge the admiration of the world.

I am proud to claim these great people—the British, the Chinese, and the Russians—as our allies, and if they had not fought as they have I shudder to think where we would be today.

And I likewise wonder, if we had not passed the Lend-Lease Act when we did and had not given them the planes, the tanks, the guns, and the munitions with which they have been fighting, where they would be now and how much nearer our enemies would be to us at this hour.

Lend-lease has not only helped our allies abroad; it has also helped us at home in preparing for our own participation and defense. It was by the launching of lend-lease that we started to make America the arsenal of democracy, and it marked the beginning of the conversion of our industrial plants into war industries. The speed with which our industrial plants were transformed into munition plants for our defense is a high tribute to the industry and ingenuity of America and is a feat unparalleled in the history of any other country.

I agree fully with the statement contained in our report, that it is imperative that the United States provide China with all the aid that can be supplied, and that it must be done with the utmost speed. The traditional friendship between China and the United States would of itself demand that this be done, but when we consider also the long and heroic fight, the sufferings and sacrifices of the Chinese people, who have literally been fighting with their hands, the American people feel that more substantial aid must be given to China to help her carry on the gallant fight that she has made.

The committee investigated this matter in executive session, and while I cannot disclose what evidence was deduced, I think that I can say that our Government realizes the importance of this tragic situation, and that everything will be done at the earliest possible moment to remedy it. We were thrilled by the magnificent address of Mme. Chiang, and her message through us to the American people will not go unheeded.

I shall not argue with those who object to calling this the Lend-Lease Act. The words "lend lease" do not appear in the act. Its title is "An act to promote the defense of the United States." "Lend-lease" is a mere nickname, but my experience is that it is difficult to eliminate a nickname, either in designating laws or individuals. It is not important as to what this act is called—the real thing that counts is what has it accomplished.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. With respect to this matter of nicknames, I wonder if the gentleman would not think this idea

of calling it a mutual war aid would be rather more descriptive for what we are doing at this time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think that may be so, but it is very difficult to get rid of a nickname. It is just like the case of calling a boy "Sonny" and when he grows up a great many people still call him "Sonny."

Mr. JONKMAN. And so far as the supplies are concerned, in respect to whatever name may be given the act, it is just another case of a rose by any other name smelling just as sweet.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Lend-lease is the great reservoir or the clearing house through which we furnish material aid to our allies, and by which they furnish us material aid. It is the pooling of the resources of our country and our allies with which to win this war, and nothing aside from the actual fighting is as important, and without it the fighting would have to stop. It has meant much thus far in whatever success we have had, and it will mean much more now since production capacity is now being reached in this country. No one act passed by Congress has contributed more and will contribute more to the defeat of the Axis.

Some months after the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, the press carried a story from a war correspondent in Europe of an interview with a German who was a Hitler satellite, and the correspondent was talking with this German about who was going to win the war, and the old German said that Hitler was going to lose, and when asked why, he replied that when the United States passed the Lend-Lease Act, it meant Hitler's doom.

I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the interview, but I know that I did read it in the press, and I think that in the years to come history will record the old German's statement as having been prophetically true.

When we pass this bill tomorrow, as we are going to do, we will have contributed something toward the winning of this war.

Sometimes we minimize and fail to realize the importance of the work that we do here. When Admiral Stark was Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, I said to him, "Admiral, the Navy is the first line of defense," to which he replied, "You are in error. The Congress is the first line of defense—the Navy can do nothing until you pass the laws and make the appropriation by which the Navy is built and operates."

And as we vote upon this bill, let us remember as we vote that by its passage we are hastening the day of victory and giving aid, not only to our allies, but to our own brave boys who are fighting on land, on the sea, and in the air, on Guadalcanal, New Guinea, China, Burma, and north Africa. As they are fighting and giving their lives on the battle fronts, may we not fail them here.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I, too, shudder to think what might have happened to this country had not this act been passed 2 years ago. The ranking members of

this committee are a few to whom so many owe so much for checking barbarism and preserving civilization. Permit me to express now publicly my appreciation of the splendid work which the gentleman now addressing us in the Well of the House, as one of those Members, has done in the passage of the act originally. I feel that this policy is the first line of defense for America and the beginning of victory, ultimately.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank my good friend for the compliment which he pays me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I need not call attention to the fact that a little more than 2 years ago when this original bill was passed, Great Britain was literally hanging on the ropes, and that she and poor little Greece, which was soon to be overrun by the Nazi juggernaut, were the only two democracies defending themselves, constituting the only armies which stood across the route of Hitler and Tojo to us. It was a solemn, a critical moment in the history of the United States, and of the world, a time which I think may very well be recorded as one of the turning points in the progress and history of the world. Most of you recall that at that time a very prominent witness before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who was quite familiar with Europe, expressed positively the opinion that Hitler could not be defeated, that a stalemate was the best that we could hope for and strongly urged a negotiated peace. Unfortunately the circumstances at that time were such that many Americans agreed with Colonel Lindbergh in that opinion. Therefore, it is delightful to compare the situation which exists now with that which existed then, which enabled our leaders at Casablanca to indulge in the clarion call for unconditional surrender—an unconditional surrender which we must and will experience, when our enemies are defeated. We stopped too soon before, and we must not do so again. I thoroughly agree with one of the distinguished gentlemen who this morning referred to that battle for the lend-lease bill 2 years ago as history. We have no corner on patriotism on our side of the aisle, and among those on the other side who agreed with us at that time. Those who opposed that bill were just as patriotic and as anxious to do what was necessary for the defense of this country as we, and it was entirely a matter of difference of opinion as to the best method of approach. I recall that one of the original opponents of the lend-lease bill at that time introduced an amendment to lend Great Britain \$2,000,000,000 with the inference that more would be forthcoming if necessary. I cannot refrain in passing from paying tribute to those ladies and gen-

tlemen, my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, who disagreed with us at that time. I wish to sincerely thank and heartily congratulate them on the very fine, patriotic cooperation in which they indulged in the recent hearings, which enabled us to bring the extension of lend-lease to the floor unamended, and with a unanimous report which, of course, would have been entirely impossible but for the fine cooperation of those patriotic ladies and gentlemen.

The first lend-lease in history was from Britain to us, of shore batteries, to defend our coast in the quasi-war with France in 1799. In fact, prior to the World War Great Britain, which was then the financial power, with possibly one insignificant exception, never assisted its allies by a direct loan, but by subsidy.

Furthermore, it seems that our experiment in lending money to our allies to assist them in carrying on mortal conflict during the World War was unique. I need not call your attention to the unhappy result of those loans, to the bitterness which resulted in the minds of our people, who naturally considered those debts to be honest debts, owed to us, which should be paid. There was such a feeling along that line among our people that the Congress passed the Johnson Act, preventing the loaning of money to those nations in arrears to us in these debts. I have an idea, although it was not mentioned in the hearings 2 years ago or recently, that it was the belief of those charged with responsibility for our foreign policy and the defense of this country, that that bitterness had grown to such proportions that it would be easier to side-step the Johnson Act, as it were, by the passage of the lend-lease bill, than to amend that act. I think that was the real foundation of lend-lease in this war.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In order that there may be no confusion on names, I presume the gentleman refers to the act passed at the instigation of Senator HIRAM JOHNSON of California years ago, when he refers to the Johnson Act?

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Since our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], who, with others, has facilitated aid to our allies, has just spoken, I feared some might misunderstand and get mixed on those names. There are Johnsons and Johnsons.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes. I referred to Senator JOHNSON of California, who was just as sincere, no doubt, as our colleagues who opposed us 2 years ago. That was the attitude of a great majority of our people then.

In fact, the passage of the Lend-Lease Act was merely the final step in the functioning of democracy, as it brought the attitude of a great majority of the people of this country from that of strict isolationism, step by step, to a realization of the necessity for and determination to have, cost what it may, total, all-out national defense of this country. I will not take the time to dwell on those steps.

Suffice it to call attention to the fact that the people of America were leaning so far backward in their determination not to be justly charged with military mindedness, that when we had several hundred thousand of the flower of the youth of America in C. C. C. camps, Army housed, Army clothed, equipped, fed, and officered, public sentiment would not even permit us to give them 30 minutes or an hour a day of military training, which would have been very, very valuable, indeed, a little while later.

The passage of lend-lease, as I say, will go down in history as one of the turning points of history. It has accomplished much. Who can say that Great Britain could have continued to hold on to the rail without the assistance of lend-lease? I am very confident that the British Eighth Army could not possibly have been so successful in driving Rommel back 2,000 miles had it not enjoyed that tremendous number of tanks, guns, planes, and other matériel which was shunted to it on almost a moment's notice from the field of operation for which it was intended. Down in the South Pacific I am very confident that it would have been entirely impossible for our own fine boys to have enjoyed the success they have had if it been necessary to use much of the tonnage in which the ammunition, guns, and other matériel went to them, for food to sustain their bodies, which was unnecessary because, as you have been informed today, a great majority of the food for those boys was furnished, as reciprocal aid, by Australia and New Zealand. These countries above have supplied our troops more beef and veal than we have furnished all our allies. I think no one will deny that the recent magnificent drive of the Russian Army, of which we are so proud, would not have enjoyed quite the success that it did, had we not sent to that front the tremendous amounts of planes and guns that have been mentioned to you.

I must confess that I shared what I think was the natural disappointment over the failure of the leader of the Russian nation to mention that assistance from us and from Great Britain, in his Red Army Day order of the day. But I then thought of the fact that the last time that outstanding leader urgently demanded a second front, the flotilla carrying the Army and the matériel to create that front in north Africa was already afloat, of which he was certainly aware. I felt and have felt since that his statement then was a part of the broad United Nations' strategy to throw sand in our enemies' eyes. I have hoped, likewise, since Red Army Day, that history repeated itself and that again Premier Stalin was throwing sand in Hitler's eyes by playing down the magnitude of lend-lease, and until I know more of what our Ambassador said I shall continue to so hope.

In such a tremendous program as lend-lease mistakes have undoubtedly occurred. It would be difficult to imagine a program of that magnitude being carried out without mistakes.

However, the main ones which have come to my attention and which came to the attention of the committee, when

run down, as has been mentioned on the floor, were found to be either without foundation at all or entirely justified. In other words, you need pay no attention to the beer, powder puffs, and charges of that nature.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I join with the gentleman in his praise which he proffered to the ability of the Administrator, in the administration of lend-lease, in the prompt and courteous way in which he has disposed of any and all complaints, and I believe it was extremely helpful in bringing the bill favorably before the American people.

I apologize for interrupting the gentleman's brilliant statement on this important measure.

Mr. JARMAN. That is perfectly all right, and I sincerely thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who is such a valuable member of our committee, for his contribution. What I had in mind, in referring to conduct being justified, was particularly such matters as the distribution of food in England, which I have not time to go into. At first it seemed out of order to me, but as the gentleman I am sure will agree, as soon as we learned the real facts, it was perfectly justified.

The President, indeed, chose wisely in his selection of Mr. Stettinius to carry out this important program, and I think he has done an outstanding job, for which we, the American people, and particularly our allies, will always be under great obligation to him and for which I wish to thank and congratulate him.

Every one, of course, would have preferred that more materials go to China, that magnificent nation which started the resistance. Of course China, I am sure the Chinese people feel, has been resisting Japan forever; more power to her and God bless her free people. I was speaking of Europe when I said only two democracies were resisting. That sentiment is unanimous throughout the United States, but it is simply one of the tragedies of war that the situation is such that it has been impossible heretofore, particularly since Japan attacked us, for us to convey more goods to China. I assure you that the Lend-Lease Administrator, the Foreign Affairs Committee—and while I cannot speak for him you know what the President has said—we are widely awake to the necessity that more goods go to China at the earliest possible moment, and I think it is perfectly safe to predict that the time is not far distant when the amount of lend-lease aid which has heretofore gone to China will fade into insignificance when compared with that which will be going every single month throughout the remainder of this war, until such time as China can be made the base for attack on Japan, that Great Britain is for attack on the European continent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Of course, there are many fine results of lend-lease, but it seems to me that outstanding among

them are two, which are closely related: First, the undoubted fact that lend-lease already has greatly shortened this war and will shorten it considerably more during this year 1943.

Second, and related to that, or as a partial result of it, the thousands—and it may go into hundreds of thousands—of American lives which have been and will be saved by our putting our materials, our guns, our munitions into the hands of our allies thereby permitting them to use them properly against the common enemy, thus avoiding the necessity of so many casualties on our part.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are the outstanding accomplishments of lend-lease, from my viewpoint.

The time is not available to me to go into the matter of reciprocal aid, but I am sure that has been and will be thoroughly discussed. I do want to mention just one or two items: Great Britain has rendered more reciprocal aid than any other country, because we have more soldiers there and we will have rendered her more aid. Over a long period of time Great Britain has had a pay roll of \$240,000 weekly for labor furnished to our army. When the north African campaign was in preparation two senior supply officers who were quartered or established at our headquarters told our command that whatever was needed for this invasion that could not be transported from America in time was theirs simply for the asking, provided it was available in the British Isles. Part of the assistance rendered during that invasion, assistance the magnitude of which we find it hard to visualize, was one item that impressed me greatly. When it was found that certain radio equipment in our planes was not suitable to the north African climate—and this discovery was made only shortly before the invasion—immediately upon being informed of that fact those British supply officers literally stripped the British Isles of that material so that our planes might be adequately and properly equipped when they went into action.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Gladly.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understand—perhaps I am wrong—that the theory of the campaign in the Near East is that whoever dominates the Near East dominates the world, and therefore it is important to us to be fighting there because we would be better off in the post-war period to have England dominating the Near East than some other country. At the same time is it not true and perhaps more important to England and the British Empire to dominate the Near East than it is to America to have England dominate the Near East?

Mr. JARMAN. That is probably true. However, the all-important consideration is to make sure that both Great Britain and the United States make all-out contributions toward preventing the Axis from dominating that part of the world.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And the great thing at present, and more important, is to win this war.

Mr. JARMAN. Certainly. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and also the gentlewoman for hers.

The very cooperative way in which this whole lend-lease concept has been carried out by all concerned surpasses any cooperation in the history of great coalitions. It augurs well, I think, for the future cooperation of the United Nations in seeing that this Old World continues to be a decent place in which to live. It is our best basis for hope for the long period of uninterrupted tranquility and peace for which we all so earnestly hope and fervently pray.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the need for the action of Congress affirmatively in the continuation of the lend-lease administration is felt, of course, very strongly by the Members on both sides of the aisle. I have voted in the past for this program and will this week vote to continue these functions.

I should like to say in my few remarks that I wish to make that perhaps the strongest reason for the continuation of our present lend-lease program is the fact that we are in an almost wholly mechanized war, a war which calls on increased resources, especially of America, to be poured into the cauldron of this conflict.

I direct your attention to one illustration which will carry forward what I mean. When approximately 1,100 planes from many air bases in Great Britain converged over the transportation and manufacturing network of the metropolis of Cologne in Nazi Germany there were dropped from those planes in approximately 90 minutes more than 6,700,000 pounds of ammunition. If we were to go back to the days of our War Between the States we should find that in the decisive battle of Gettysburg when for 3 days the forces of the North contested with the forces of the South, in all that terrific battle there were consumed but approximately 1,300,000 pounds of ammunition; yet here in this 1 engagement of one hour and a half 6,700,000 pounds were consumed. In that one raid of 1,100 planes more than 1,000,000 gallons of high-octane gasoline were needed. To change this into another figure, it took more than 400,000 barrels of crude oil to produce that volume of gasoline for those hard-hitting bombing planes.

And so into the waging of a mechanized war go the sinews of a peacetime economy here at home and we must realize very, very deeply the sacrifice and the service which are necessary, not only for America but for the other nations who cooperate with us.

Let us, my colleagues, be certain that a mutual understanding and trust be forthcoming on this lend-lease aid. I would not inject into this debate a false note on this score, but I will say that I am

at a loss to understand why Stalin is reported to have stated February 23, "The Red Army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war." Such an utterance is almost inconceivable in the face of published figures on our assistance to Russia. The following is a news story from the Times-Herald of today:

LEND-LEASE AID TO RUSSIA OVER BILLION

Over-all lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union up to February 1, 1943, totaled \$1,300,000,000, Lend-Lease Administrator Edward R. Stettinius Jr., reported recently to congressional committees.

Some of the specific figures included:

Two thousand six hundred planes,
Three thousand two hundred tanks,
Seventy-two thousand five hundred trucks,
Seven thousand seven hundred motorcycles,

One thousand three hundred military tractors,

One hundred and thirty thousand submarine guns,

Three million pairs of boots and eighteen thousand tons of sole leather,

Seventy-five thousand tons railroad rails and other railroad equipment,

One hundred and forty thousand field telephones and "hundreds of thousands of miles" of telephone wire,

Two hundred and sixty-eight thousand tons petroleum products,

Five hundred and eighty thousand tons steel,

Forty-six thousand tons aluminum and duraluminum.

Twenty-one thousand five hundred tons of zinc,

Ninety-four thousand tons copper and brass,

Fifty thousand tons toluol and TNT,

Seventy-five thousand tons other chemicals, and

Tremendous quantities of food.

I hope it will be possible to send larger supplies to China during the coming year. I remember telling this House on March 28, 1942, that General Wong had said to me that—

The Chinese pilots are superior to Japanese, and they could have won battle after battle in the skies even though they had but one plane against four for the enemy.

Japanese forces are held in check by the bravery of China's fighting units. If that country cannot carry on this Axis partner will have men and material to shift to other fighting fronts.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that more than 3 years ago I presented legislation to this House which would have called on our Government through the President, to enter into negotiations with the British and French Governments looking toward the acquisition of certain islands owned by those two powers, those islands to be given to the United States in partial payment of the war debts that were owed to us.

The first resolution, House Joint Resolution 482, was introduced March 4, 1940. It was as follows:

Joint resolution for the acquisition of British islands in the Caribbean and British Honduras

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby requested to enter into negotiations in such manner as he may deem appropriate with the Government of Great Britain for the acquisition by the United States of the islands of the Bermudas; the Bahamas—Jamaica with the Turks, Caicos, and Cayman Islands; Trinidad and Tobago; Barbados; the Leeward

Islands—Antigua, St. Kitts, Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and Virgin Islands; the Windward Islands—Grenada, the Grenadines, St. Lucia, St. Vincent; together with British Honduras, in part payment for the indebtedness of such Government to the United States.

The second proposal was House Joint Resolution 511, introduced April 10, 1940, which was in these terms:

Joint resolution for the acquisition of French islands in the Caribbean and the North Atlantic Ocean

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby required to enter into negotiations in such manner as he may deem appropriate with the Republic of France for the acquisition by the United States of the islands of Martinique, Guadeloupe, St. Pierre, and Miquelon, in part payment for the indebtedness of such Government to the United States.

Wayne Parrish, writing in the March 1 issue of American Aviation on ownership of island bases, expressed the following thought provoking sentences:

Are we going to pay the cost of reaching these goals and turn the benefits over to others who probably could not have succeeded without our help? Such a state of affairs would leave no assurance that our share of the costs resulted in security for the future.

The legislation, similarly before the Senate, received no consideration at the hands of committees, and today I recall it only because I believe we must be thinking of these post-war problems as we rightly pass this legislation and of the responsibility of those who fight with us, in that they shall as far as possible repay to the Government of the United States, through some method, that which we have so generously extended.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have the best bases on those islands. Now, if we take over the islands, we will have to take over the people, and if we take over the people we will have to provide for them. Has the gentleman thought through to a final conclusion as to just where it might lead us and just what the long-range implications might be?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have thought the implications through. I was particularly interested, more than 3 years ago as I am now, that those islands be used for the purpose of forming a ring of steel, a citadel of defense for the United States of America against any aggressive powers that might attack us in the years to come.

I conclude with the thought that every extravagance in our individual life during these trying days on the home front—every excess in the operation of government here at home—lessens by that degree the equipment and the manpower with which we fight resourceful and ruthless foes. In my opinion, the membership of this House must in every possible way not take a second position but stand in the forefront of a determined drive to show not only to the rank and file men and women of this Republic that we are capable of leadership toward those desirable ends, but that here in the

operation of our body politic we will keep nonessentials from creeping into the cost of government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I believe in America; I believe in the destiny of our land and its people. I feel that we can cooperate fully with these other nations in the successful prosecution of this war. I know that we are still the land of liberty; I know that we remain the citadel of courage, conscience, and Christianity; I know we are the fortress of freedom; I know that we are the hope of the world; and there devolves on the individual and the collective membership of this body the responsibility for a courageous leadership which will function intelligently, not only in the passage of this legislation but in worth-while and far-reaching acts during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield some time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of what I have to say on this measure, let it be understood that I voted for the rule which makes possible the consideration of this bill, and I will vote for the passage of this bill, H. R. 1501. The considerations which impels me to make that statement are these: We are now engaged in the most frightful war the world has known, and we must win this war. Every essential thing which will lend aid to a speedy and decisive victory in this war must be extended to our own armed forces and to those who are engaged with us in this war for liberty and freedom. We cannot deprive our allies of the necessary food, munitions of war, and armament with which to carry on this war 100 percent for victory. We have charted the course upon which we have already embarked, and we cannot now turn back and leave our allies unprepared to continue the fight for victory. We must carry on, and we must aid, unstintingly, in this all-out effort to win this war to make liberty and freedom the watchwords of the nations of the world.

As we engage in the debate on this measure, we must not be unmindful that vast sums of money have already been spent in the maintenance of the so-called lend-lease program. As a matter of fact, the money, the food, the ships, planes, tanks, and guns which have been provided for our allies in this war has been largely given away. The precedent established in World War No. 1, by practically all of the foreign countries, of accepting our material assistance but of "permitting us to whistle in the dark for our pay" will, no doubt, be followed by those nations which now receive our blessing and our bounty in this war.

We suffered greatly under that policy in the last World War, and we will, no doubt, suffer greatly because of that same attitude following this World War. But, regardless of those considerations, we must resolve that we are engaged in the most frightful war the world has ever known, that we have boys from our country on every front who are now engaged in this war, that we must back up our own boys with every type and kind of supplies and munitions of war, and

that includes the proper aid in manpower, armed with the proper and necessary equipment, from all of our allies. We must not let our boys down—we cannot let our boys down. We, who cannot go to the front, must constitute the great reserve at home who will back up our boys with all we have, all we can produce, and all we can deliver to them. Our boys must go forward to ultimate victory.

Mr. Chairman, very recently the Lend-Lease Administrator made the statement that this program has resulted in a genuine pooling of the available services of the United Nations, with the United States supplying 44 countries with lend-lease food and materials, and that "lend-lease in reverse" has been contributing food, equipment, and other resources to maintain American armies on foreign soil. It is very unfortunate that we do not have available the extent to which "lend-lease in reverse" has contributed to our armed forces.

However, we do have the record on some of the extension of aid by our own country, and Mr. Stettinius, the Administrator, stated that up to January 1, 1943, the United Kingdom received \$2,440,000,000 worth of lend-lease supplies, including 10 percent of all the food it consumes. Russia received \$1,300,000,000 worth, including planes, tanks, trucks, 130,000 submachine guns, more than 98,000,000 pounds of TNT and toluol, 174,000,000 pounds of copper and brass, and large amounts of food, munitions, and raw materials. Shipments to the Middle and Far East aggregated \$1,650,000,000, including those to Australia, New Zealand, India, and China. But we are informed that the amounts already expended under the Lend-Lease Act approximate \$10,000,000,000. He further stated:

Aid to China, which has not been nearly as great as the situation requires, is increasing now and more planes are being made available for air-borne shipments into China.

It is my hope that Mr. Stettinius is correct. China has suffered greatly, and she continues to suffer. She has borne the brunt of battle for a long time, and she has stood up before her ruthless enemy half rationed, half clad and half equipped. It is my fervent hope that China will receive the necessary aid in food and supplies which will equip her armed forces to the point that she has a fair chance to drive Japan from her soil. When China is properly equipped with supplies and munitions of war—when she has planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition—I firmly believe she will aid materially in the defeat of Japan, and thus lend material aid to us in our final victory over this ruthless foe.

Mr. Chairman, it is worthy of mention at this point that in the recent report, to which I have referred, Mr. Stettinius showed that 1942 lend-lease exports of food took 5 percent of our total meat supply, 3.4 percent of all of our milk products, 13.2 percent of our fats and oils, 10 percent of our dried eggs, 7.1 percent of our frozen and canned fish, eight-tenths of 1 percent of our canned vegetables, 1.7 percent of our canned fruits and juices, three-tenths of 1 percent of our wheat products, 6

percent of our dried peas, and 5 percent of our dried beans. He further stated, "Since March 1941 we have delivered to our allies about 4,000,000 tons of foodstuffs, at a cost of a billion and a quarter dollars."

Frightful as these figures may appear, and as we face rationing of every kind here, we are using every effort to aid in winning this war—and we are content to suffer whatever hardship may be imposed upon us, which is, in fact, necessary for victory.

Yet, in the face of the huge supplies which we have sent, and which we are now sending, to our allies—we must not forget—and I hope Mr. Stettinius will not forget—that we have a terrific food problem at home which must be solved. We cannot send food and supplies to all of the countries of the world which are either friendly to us, or which are engaged in this war with us, and at the same time maintain our own Army and Navy, and supply our own people with the necessities of life. And, with the present shortage of food in this country, and with the great shortage of food which will become a reality before the end of 1943, the Lend-Lease Administrator has a problem which will call for immediate action.

I make that statement, Mr. Chairman, because we now have a great shortage of food here, which is evidenced by the rationing of food of almost every type. Many farmers are quitting farming because their farm boys, and their farm help, has been taken into the Army. In the central and midwestern sections of our country, where farming is the principal occupation, the newspapers are well filled with notices of farm sales, and many of those sale notices begin with the statement, "because my boy has been inducted into the service of his country, I am compelled to sell out and quit farming," while others contain this preliminary statement, "because of the scarcity of farm help, I am unable to operate my farm and I am forced to sell out and quit," and this tells the story, in part. Another cause of the loss of farm labor and farm help has been the exceptionally high wages that have been paid by defense plants, and this has made inroads among those who have heretofore engaged in assisting in farm work. But, the net result has been that the farmer—those who produce the food in this country—have suffered greatly, and many of them have sold out—they have sold their livestock and their farm—and many of them have sold their livestock, but retain their farm, which will be idle during the year 1943, because they cannot secure the necessary labor with which to operate it. This will cause a great shortage in the production of food.

Mr. Chairman, we find some very pertinent statements in the press of today. One of those statements, which relates to the food situation appears to come from Secretary of Agriculture, Claude Wickard, in which he states that—

The public will have to eat animal feed as substitutes for meat.

In the very same newspaper we find the bold headlines, as follows:

Stalin hides United States aid.

This startling statement comes from Ambassador Standley, stationed at Moscow. In the purported statement of Ambassador Standley, at a press conference, he is reported to have stated:

It is not fair to mislead Americans into giving millions from their pockets, thinking that they are aiding the Russian people, without the Russian people knowing about it.

The Ambassador further stated, according to reports:

I have been carefully looking for recognition by the Russian press of the fact that they are getting material help through America not only through Lend-Lease but through the Red Cross and the Russian-American Relief, and I have failed to find any acknowledgment of that.

This attitude on the part of Russia is unexplainable. It is unthinkable that Russia, or her leaders, want to suppress from the people of that country the fact that we are lending aid of every character in this war.

Mr. Chairman, following up this information regarding the farmers and their inability to farm their farms because of the lack of farm labor, may I say that within the past few days I have received numerous letters from farmers in the district which I have the honor to represent, in which they gave me the lists of farmers who were either quitting farming, or were materially reducing the acreage they would farm in 1943, all because of this obstruction. Especially do I wish to refer to a lady, who resides in one of the counties of the Tenth District of Indiana, who has ever been one of the outstanding farm women in her county, and she enclosed to me 14 notices of farm sales, all published in one issue of her county newspaper, being the farmers who were selling their dairy herds, and their livestock and farm implements, and some of them were offering their farm land for sale. What does this mean, Mr. Chairman? There can be but one answer, and that is that the production of our food supply will be greatly reduced in 1943. We are rationed now because there is a shortage. Before the end of 1943 that shortage will be much greater, because of the reduced production of food.

Mr. Chairman, we must not forget that the production of food on the farms was 12 percent greater in 1942 than in any previous year of record. Yet, with that tremendous overproduction we have our present food shortage, and this shortage threatens to become very much worse. Recently the Department of Agriculture announced a program for 1943 that will average better than 14 percent increase in 10 leading items. Warnings that this proposed increase, even with favorable weather conditions equal to that of 1942, cannot be met have not gone unheeded. In testimony, recently given, the Secretary of Agriculture was not optimistic that the program which he proposed could succeed.

On last Saturday the War Manpower Commissioner issued orders to cease drafting essential farm workers, even though the quota was not filled, and since that time, that same Commissioner, in a move to secure more selective-service registrants for farming, issued an order

reclassifying all men over 38 years of age who are now farming or who will enter farming by May 1 of this year. This recent move is encouraging, indeed. We hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Administrator of lend-lease funds will come to realize the shortage of food in this country at this moment, and the threat of a greater shortage in the future, and that he will govern himself accordingly. We cannot stand idly by and see our own people, in this country, go hungry, and witness the exporting of vast amounts of our food to other countries. We are at war, but we must feed our people at home, as well as those in other countries.

As we go forward, let us win this war, let us feed our Army and our Navy, let us feed our own people, and whatever remains let our allies have the benefit of all that food. But we must realize that we cannot finance and feed the world in time of war, when we are engaged in a terrific struggle to win a victory. Let us conserve, let judgment prevail, and victory will be ours.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us extends the so-called Lend-Lease Act for a period of 1 year. The original act was considered and passed by the House early in 1941 long before we entered the war. It was urged by the administration that the passage of this act would keep us out of war, and many insisted we would likely not be called upon to furnish more than \$7,000,000,000 of war equipment and other supplies. It is fair to say one of the proponents of the bill readily admitted it was a war measure and amounted to practically a declaration of war.

It was also claimed by the proponents that it was a sale, lend, or lease of this equipment and materials to nations friendly to us. Many of us believed it was a war measure and would likely involve us in the bloody European-African-Asiatic War, and that there would be no sale, lend, or lease, but, as a matter of fact, it would turn out to be a gift and that the sky would be the limit. We opposed the original bill for these reasons, and for the further reason that we were unwilling to grant to the President the far-reaching and extraordinary power to give away any or all of our ships, bombers, planes, guns, tanks, shells, or other war matériel and food supplies without limit to whomsoever he might desire.

We are now in the war, and each and every one of us desires to do whatever is necessary to win the war at the earliest possible moment, bring victory to American arms, save as many lives as possible, get our boys, including my own son back home, lessen the war burdens of our people, and restore our country to peace and normal conditions.

The lend-lease is one of the few authorizations of Congress through the years that has no dollar limit—the sky is the limit. Congress already has actually appropriated sixty-three billions and

no one can say how much more will be turned over to the President to give away before the war is over.

The records of the Treasury Department show that the United States spent on the First World War from its beginning on April 6, 1917, to the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918, twenty-one billions. We can see there have already been appropriated and put at the disposal of the President, under this so-called lend-lease three times the cost of the First World War from its beginning to the signing of the armistice.

It is claimed, however, that only about ten billions of this sum have actually been used in war equipment and supplies turned over to other countries by the President. We had turned over to the British Empire up to December 31, 1942, about six and one-half billions. We are informed that sum has now increased to about eight billions. We have turned over to Russia in all up to this time about two and one-half billions, and we have turned over to China less than two hundred millions to this date. We have made lend-lease contributions to practically all the countries of Central and South America and the West Indies. The Administration reports that 43 nations are entitled to lend-lease benefits; 30 nations have signed up for these benefits, and I assume that benefits heretofore have been given to 30 nations.

The President, the War and Navy Departments, and our high military and naval officers have urged that the Lend-Lease Act be extended for 1 year. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the House, by unanimous vote, approved this extension for 1 year. As we are in the war, and it is urged that this act will be helpful in winning the war, it is my purpose to vote for this extension as a war measure. The hopes of those who favored it as a measure to keep us out of war have been blasted.

There are persons in this country, over the radio and in magazines and newspapers, advocating the use of the so-called lend-lease policy as a post-war activity. They would use our taxpayers' money to carry out a super or glorified world W. P. A. and undertake to feed and clothe some 500,000,000 people throughout the world for many years. The burdens of the American people will be such at the close of the war that we cannot pour out additional billions to carry on such a utopian scheme. I oppose such a policy, and I am sure the American people generally will oppose that policy.

Then there are other internationally politically minded groups who have it in mind to set up a supergovernment of the world after the war, and to use lend-lease billions to entice the people of various countries to join in this supergovernment. In this supergovernment the United States would be merely one of the units, with representation in this supergovernment, but subject to executive, legislative, and judicial branches, superior to and controlling our country and other countries of the world. I am opposed to our country entering into or becoming a part of such a supergovernment. Of course, the United States would be called upon to carry the major

part of the load of supporting such a supergovernment, with only one voice out of many voices in its direction and control. Not one dollar of lend-lease should be used to carry out such a purpose. The lend-lease should be maintained and operated for the sole purpose of providing essential and necessary aid in the winning of the war, and when the war is over this great burden should be removed from the backs of the overburdened taxpayers of this Nation.

The American people have been told lend-lease is a two-way proposition; that we let other countries have war equipment and matériel and supplies, and they in turn furnish us with war equipment, matériel, and supplies. We show them in dollars and cents the value of what we have furnished. There is no such showing on the part of our allies. They give in some cases tons, pounds, but they do not submit any statement as to the dollar value. I think it can be safely said that for every dollar we put into lend-lease that no more than 10 cents is given to us.

We do not have a sufficient check and audit of these billions that are being given away by the President and no audit of the things we receive. It is only fair to the people of this country that such an audit and checking be furnished to the Congress, and we hope to have an opportunity to vote for an amendment that will require a checking and audit of all the things we have given away under the lend-lease and those things we have received.

No doubt the lend-lease has been of very material help to Great Britain and her dependencies and to Russia. The matter of deepest regret is, we have been able to furnish so little to China. We have furnished China, according to the latest report, less than \$160,000,000. China has been fighting since 1937. Millions of her people have been killed and other millions have been starved to death. Many of her great cities have been practically wiped out, and a big part of her country has been overrun by the Japs. Much less than 3 percent of lend-lease has gone to China. She needs it more than any other country. She is nearer to our territory, and will be of greater service than any other country in helping us to get back our own soil—the Philippines and other island possessions in the Pacific. Should China be knocked out of the war it will greatly lengthen the war, and it will mean the loss of hundreds of thousands of American lives, and cost tens of billions to our country. A way must be found, and found now, to help China. We owe this to China for another reason: From 1937 to 1941, while China was fighting heroically for her very life, our country was furnishing Japan more than 50 percent of her war matériel and supplies in the way of gas, oil, scrap iron, food, and other products; Britain and Holland furnished Japan more than 30 percent. Army and Navy men agree Japan could never have overrun and plundered China but for the supplies furnished to her during those 4 years by our country,

Britain, and Holland—and our country. Britain, and Holland are now paying dearly.

I have always been of the opinion, and still hold that opinion, that Japan is the greatest threat to our country and our possessions. Our real danger is in the Pacific. Action against Japan must not be delayed until Japan can consolidate and develop the natural resources of the territory which she has taken from us, Holland, Great Britain, and China. Every day she holds these possessions she strengthens her ability to wage a long and costly war against us. Let us not forget the United States and China will have to bear the major burden of whipping the Japs. We are flying bombers to Australia, Egypt, and India. Why do we not fly a lot of bombers to China? They must have help and have it now.

VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE AND RUSSIA

The press reports Vice President WALLACE in his speech at the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, on yesterday as saying:

If the United States double-crosses Russia there will be another war.

This is a most unfortunate statement. This is the first intimation that we have had that there had been or is any effort on the part of the people or the Government of the United States to double-cross Russia or mistreat her in any way. We wonder what caused the Vice President to make such a statement. He is a part of the Roosevelt administration. If there is any double-crossing of Russia on the part of the administration, the Vice President should know about it. I cannot believe that there is any effort on the part of the administration or the American people to double-cross Russia in this war. We all appreciate the heroic defense that the Russians have made of their people, their homes, and their country.

Our country has aided Russia in a most generous way and will continue to aid her in winning the war. We have given her over 3,000 of our best bombers and planes, many thousand of our best tanks, 130,000 machine guns, nearly 100,000 motortrucks and other vehicles, as well as ammunition and other munitions of war. We shipped to her last year 17,000,000 pounds of butter, and we have agreed to ship to her this year 170,000,000 pounds of butter and, as a matter of fact, we have less than 50,000,000 pounds in reserve for our own use. The American people have denied themselves butter, as well as other food and supplies, to send to the aid of Russia. We are eating oleomargarine instead of butter and will lessen our consumption of butter and increase our consumption of oleomargarine. Up to this time we have sent to Russia two and one-half billions worth of munitions of war and other supplies. There is no doubt but what the United States will do her full share and more in aiding Russia and other allies.

Last year we spent nearly eighty billion on our war effort. Russia spent about fifteen billion and Great Britain

nineteen billion. This year we plan to spend more than one hundred billion and the British Empire twenty-one billion. China spent last year about five billion. It can be seen that the people of the United States are putting up more than twice as much as Russia, Great Britain, and China combined in this war. We are calling 11,000,000 men and boys into our armed forces. We have approximately 132,000,000 people and three and one-half million square miles of territory. Russia has nearly 200,000,000 people with 8,819,791 square miles of territory. The British Empire has 500,000,000 people with over 16,000,000 square miles of territory. China has about 450,000,000 people with 4,314,097 square miles.

No seamen have surpassed in heroism the seamen of our merchant marine in carrying supplies to Russia and Great Britain. The United States has not double-crossed Russia or any other country and will not do so. It would be well for the O. W. I. to censor the speeches of our Vice President. Statements such as his can serve no purpose except to create suspicion and stir up discord, and add to the worries and fears of the American people. The American people are giving their all to win this war. Why say that our country is doing or may do something to bring on a third world war and with one of our allies?

PROTECT FARMERS, WORKERS, AND INDUSTRY

I understand that an amendment will be offered to this bill giving the House and Senate an opportunity to pass upon the final benefits as provided in the original Lend-Lease Act growing out of any lend-lease agreements with the various nations. We deem such an amendment very necessary in order to protect American labor, the American farmer, and American industry. Under the Lend-Lease Act, the President is clothed with extraordinary powers. We do not want any agreements entered into affecting adversely American labor, the American farmer, and American industry after the war. This lend-lease program is receiving support now because it is a war measure, and must not be used to carry out the economic, social, or political schemes of theorists. We must preserve the American Constitution, private enterprise, our national credit, and the American way of life.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy indeed to have evidence that the members of the majority party are concerned that we not spend money, time, and energy upon unnecessary things during the war period. It is a relief to those of us who have been striving for some time to confine the expenditures to the war and to do those things which will equip our boys and the armies of our allies. I am delighted to have the expressions we have just heard from the honorable gentleman from West Virginia.

As you know, your committee held hearings on the resolution to extend

lend-lease. A period of perhaps 4 weeks, I am sure you will agree with me, was too short a time indeed to go into the details and the far-reaching implications of the act. Some of the material contained in the printed hearings was submitted at the very end of the hearings. These are not reflected in the report in any way. I suggest that you make a very careful study of the last pages, not the editorials that were inserted at the end but the testimony submitted by the Lend-Lease Administrator and others in the last part of the hearings. You will find it an exceedingly worth-while study.

Many of the matters upon which the Foreign Affairs Committee could touch only lightly will, of course, be considered in greater detail when they come before the Appropriations Committee. But based upon the study that we did make—and we did give ourselves as conscientiously as it is humanly possible to do to the study of the bill—it is my considered opinion that the resolution to extend the life of the Lend-Lease Act should have the support of all Members of the House. I should mention also that everyone is in agreement with the honorable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] when he said that mistakes were made. Of course, mistakes were made; mistakes in judgment and administration both. It would be folly to attempt to present it as an infallible instrument. It would be almost ridiculous to assume that any man or any group of men could carry out the permissives contained within the act with unflinching good judgment. But it was the method set up by a majority vote of the Congress first to help England, then it was expanded to help such other of the United Nations as the President found vital to the defense of the United States.

In the course of his testimony before the House committee, Mr. Stettinius said:

If we look back . . . we realize that a principle has been hammered out in a time of crisis. That principle is the principle of total cooperation among the nations in the waging of war, cooperation in the interest of each and for the benefit of all, the only principle by which a war of alliance can be successfully waged.

I call your attention to that phrase, "total cooperation." All Government witnesses appearing before the committee reiterated time and time again that lend-lease has become a powerful agent in the development of practical cooperation between the nations. Certain is it that we need more and more cooperation, not less and less. To this end, the continuance of the techniques established would seem advisable, even essential.

It was brought out that this cooperative principle which the Allied Nations are using could serve as a framework for methods of cooperative thought and action in the post-war era, when we shall sit down together to develop bases for a durable peace.

Because it was the general desire of our committee to give to you and to the people as broad concepts as possible of the principles of mutual understanding

and cooperation being put into practice under this act, I shall not dwell on what I have called mistakes of judgment or of method that have been an inevitable part of the human equation in the development of this two-way road and which have been developed by other members of the committee for your benefit. Rather do I want to use the few minutes allotted me to call attention to certain changes that seem both advisable and necessary if this method is to carry out in fact the principle Mr. Stettinius says has been "hammered out," namely, the principle of total cooperation among the nations. This principle put into effect can point the way of the future.

The Lend-Lease Act was very much an experiment, and it has been put into operation, as experiments are, by the trial and error method. It is our present way of working with our allies and they with us. If it is to be continued, and I trust it may be, it is my opinion that it could and should be strengthened by being made more realistic and more effective. To this end I will call your attention to the hearings, which show quite conclusively that the program is operated as an integral part of a global strategy for waging war.

It is very evident that the allocation of shipment of lend-lease supplies depends upon the decisions made by the military group. The supplies are pooled. These military authorities have been brought together to decide upon war strategy and to plan procedures as to the relative strategic needs of the fronts upon which will fall the greatest burdens of the war as well as the shifting and unpredictable fortunes of battle.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the war cannot be won unless there is a completely integrated and over-all strategy, agreed upon by the United Nations or at least by the four great nations who are carrying the brunt of the fighting, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

This is true both from a military point of view and from the standpoint of developing the kind of cooperation in action and in mutual trust which is the only possible guaranty of a stable post-war world.

Therefore, if the lend-lease program is to become a truly powerful factor in developing that relationship, we ought to make it the kind of agency that will set an example for joint action of the United Nations.

The President's speech upon his return from Casablanca indicated that the general strategy for prosecuting the war makes it more necessary than ever that there be the fullest participation by the United Nations in the execution of this strategy.

It is not enough to say that our authorities have constant contact with representatives of our allies. What is needed is formal and equal participation by those sharing in the greatest sacrifices and making the greatest contributions toward the common goal. The lack of this equal and formal participation is evidenced by the cropping up of differences from time to time among the

United Nations which serve only to give fuel to those who would like to disrupt the United Nations coalition.

Recently we dealt only with England. As we grew we did not grow in our method. As the scope of the activity is extended, we should extend these boards of strategy and of conference. It is unintelligent not to. Our objective is the attainment of an unbreakable unity of the United Nations, based upon full agreement on a global strategy for speedy and complete victory and a lasting peace. The lend-lease program should and can be made a more effective instrument for achieving these objectives.

In the first place, the chief policy-making body which determines lend-lease allocations is the combined general staffs. I repeat that at present these include only the staffs of the United States and Great Britain. It is my certainty and conviction that both the Soviet Union and China should be formally included.

The instrumentalities for executing the policies of the lend-lease are the various combined boards, such as the Munitions Assignment Board, Raw Materials Board, Food Board, and so forth. These boards also should be broadened to include China and the Soviet Union. None of the witnesses heard resisted the idea, and the testimony of Mr. Stettinius indicates that he considers this a very important question and that he feels it comes entirely within the function of Congress to make suggestions. To my mind, it is not only the function of Congress but its duty in the determination of sound policies for prosecuting the war.

I am well aware that it may be argued that we cannot include two of our allies and omit the rest, and that such full inclusion would be unwieldy and unworkable. To my mind, the other nations would be thoroughly satisfied to have the combined war boards consist of representatives from the four nations upon whom victory depends, namely, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China. The fate of all the other nations depends upon these major allies.

It can be argued further that inasmuch as the Soviet Union is not at war with Japan she therefore could not sit in on joint strategy meetings without creating a strain in her relations with Japan. Why not let her be the judge of that? After all, she could be given the opportunity. Surely we cannot be so naive as to believe that some plan could not be worked out which would make it clear that her participation would be limited to those strategy questions having to deal with the enemy we are fighting in common.

China is fighting with us. Her situation is clear. She has withstood the enemy over a period of years with unbelievable courage. She is an essential part of allied strength and strategy in Asia, but she is not represented on the combined general staffs or upon the combined boards of the lend-lease agency.

Incidentally, may I inject here that our arrangements with China could be put immediately upon a protocol basis as are

those with Russia, that she might have at once a larger proportion of our production and better priorities.

It has been argued that these combined boards, including the chiefs of staff, are limited to the United States and the United Kingdom because they are the chief producing nations. Such an argument cannot stand against the constant reiteration by witnesses and by all exponents of lend-lease that it is an over-all program of reciprocal assistance and that an incalculable factor must be in terms of human life, of territory, and of their consequent suffering and immeasurable courage. The testimony as well as the language of the master agreements repeat time and time again that the mutual benefits cannot be counted in dollars and cents alone. The philosophy of lend-lease, as I understand it, is based upon such contributions by each nation best calculated to serve the common goal.

It seems obvious that if it is to serve the common welfare, it must be based upon a common strategy for conducting the war. Any other approach minimizes both the effectiveness of lend-lease aid during the war, and the possibilities for the fullest development of mutual confidence and trust among the United Nations for victory and a durable peace. Therefore, I would urge upon this body the consideration of methods by which the organization of lend-lease make itself more truly the combined effort of the four great decisive Allied Nations, that it may reflect more truly the desire of the people of these United States to work in closest possible cooperation with these powers, with the hope that the attitudes and the understandings growing out of such mutual cooperation may prove to be a framework upon which can be built the structure of world peace. I am in hearty agreement with those who suggested that in some manner we try to establish a different nickname for the bill. Mutual war aid does very much better express the meaning, the reality, and the actuality of what is going on today. I also urge upon the House at this moment that it feel its responsibility for the emphasis upon this strategy of the war from the focal point of this strategy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, when the original lend-lease bill was before us in 1941, I was among those who opposed it, and who wrote and signed the minority report setting forth the reasons why we did not think it would accomplish its avowed purpose of keeping the United States out of the war, and proposing what we believed were equally effective and much less dangerous means of this country extending aid to our friends across the seas. Those of us who opposed the Lend-Lease Act in 1941 did so because we believed it would carry us closer to war and perhaps bring our involvement in a bloody conflict which

we were not prepared to fight and which we hoped wise diplomacy and a sharply stepped-up hemispheric-preparedness program would enable us to avoid. Proponents of the act heralded it as an act to keep us out of war.

Following a protracted debate, however, Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act, after 160 Members of this House had expressed a preference for the alternative plan outlined in the minority report, and which was incorporated in a bill, which I had introduced in the House. Once lend-lease became the law of the land, I voted for all of the appropriations to implement it, because our own preparedness was then tied in with it, and today I am taking the floor to urge Members to vote for this bill extending the effectiveness of the Lend-Lease Act for another 12 months. I do this because, with America at war, lend-lease has become an important part of our whole war program. It is closely connected and inextricably interwoven with all of the problems of supplying our own fighting forces, and with keeping supplied our allies, fighting with us for victory in this war.

While lend-lease failed in the avowed purpose expressed by its 1941 supporters, of keeping us out of war, it is today a war measure, and as such, merits your support, in my opinion, the same as you vote for guns or ships or tanks or planes to be used in fighting the war. It is a device today for advancing our cause in the war and the hurrying up of victory for our side of the fight.

I think it would be folly to stop in the middle of war to develop some other program of interallied cooperation in interchanging supplies of war between members of the United Nations. I think even if lend-lease were not being wisely administered it would be better now to attempt to improve the administration of it than to set up now in the middle of the war an entirely new and different machinery for serving the objective it supplies.

However, today I am particularly gratified in my own mind in being able to urge the extension of this act for another 12 months, because I think that the act by and large has been wisely administered and we do not have that particular hurdle to cross. I think that under the administration of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., that gentleman has brought to the administration of lend-lease a wealth of patriotic and sincere effort and ability, which can give the entire country a feeling of satisfaction that the act is being wisely and well administered. Throughout our hearings Mr. Stettinius was available for consultation with the committee, and eager to receive criticisms, and happy to make corrections wherever the criticisms seemed to be well founded. I would like to quote just a short statement about the administration of lend-lease which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington of Friday, March 5, in the column of Mr. Frank R. Kent. He says:

Lend-lease was the President's plan. It was he who presented it to the last Congress and

obtained its adoption. But the sort of non-partisan support it is now receiving is certainly largely due to the character and personality of Mr. Stettinius himself.

In his appearances before congressional committees, there has been nothing of the swagger and arrogance typical of some of the agency heads and nothing of the tricky evasion typical of others. On the contrary, his complete candor in answering questions and providing full information, plus the obvious fact that he knows what he is doing and how to do it, made the kind of impression that compelled the response he got.

I am sure that every member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee agrees with this summary by Frank Kent, and is happy over the fact that Mr. Stettinius is the Director and Administrator of Lend-Lease.

Now that I have made my position clear regarding my conviction that lend-lease should be extended another 12 months, I want to record some observations growing out of the month of hearings we devoted to the bill—and I might say in connection with these hearings, because my genial friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and I endeavored futilely but with determination 2 years ago to have open and adequate hearings on lend-lease, that we have no complaint to make this time about the type of hearings that were conducted in connection with the extension of the Lend-Lease Act.

I still wish we could have had hearings of this type 2 years ago when that memorable bill was before the Congress; but I want to say I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], joins me in that feeling that we congratulate the committee and the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], on the fact that this time no gag rule was applied. This time we were permitted to have complete and adequate hearings. I sincerely hope that this is a harbinger, indicating the type of hearings we shall have henceforth in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. It was exceedingly gratifying to observe this improved procedure and I think that was one reason why we were able to work out minor differences in the writing of the committee report and present to you not two reports, as we have done so many times in the past, but a unified, unanimous committee report, which, while it is true, does not represent exactly the precise and complete opinions of each member of the committee, still does provide a common denominator of attitudes which we were all happy to sign, thus presenting to you a unanimous report by our committee.

I cannot join in all the high superlatives engaged in by some of the Members speaking in behalf of this bill. After all, this is just a piece of man-made legislation. We are not asking you to pass upon some gilded lily or some utopian scheme handed down from Mount Olympus by halo-bearing gods. We are asking you to extend for another 12 months a man-made answer to a very serious human problem, and, as a man-made piece of legislation, it is subject to all the ills and woes to which we human beings

are heir. I think therefore that after we have, I hope by almost unanimous vote, extended the Lend-Lease Act for another 12 months, the Congress will not retire to the cloakroom and fall asleep at the switch, congratulating itself that it has done its job and that victory must now certainly be imminent. The administration of the Lend-Lease Act is a colossal job and even with so great and good an administrator as Mr. Stettinius, he needs the support, the constructive criticisms, and suggestions of the Members of the House and of the Senate.

I am glad that at least the House Committee on Foreign Affairs spent 4 long weeks in analyzing the legislation, in presenting criticisms to the Administrator, in having his replies in clarifying the atmosphere, unlike the rather sorry spectacle presented by a similar committee of another body that did not take the time to investigate conditions, but folded up its tent after hearing a witness or two, saying that everything must be O. K. I am glad that we have at least made a conscientious effort to get before the country and the Congress the facts involved in the case. I beseech the Members of this body, because I believe the salvation of this Republic lies primarily with the Members of the House of Representatives, after we have approved the extension of the act, to feel perfectly free to consult with the Administrator of the Lend-Lease Act and with others in authority, concerning little differences of opinion, concerning problems and criticisms, and suggestions you may have for improvements, and I urge you to make a studied effort to clarify the atmosphere and prevent false and iniquitous rumors from spreading over the country like wildfire.

I am sure a little careful discussion of the problems will frequently dispel the ugly little rumors which are not based upon facts, but which frequently grow out of a lack of knowledge or a failure to get all the facts.

THE CHINESE SITUATION

Now, let me discuss specifically five or six or seven observations, if time will permit, which have come to me from a study of this act. The first deals with the Chinese situation. It was brought out clearly in our hearings by witness after witness that what we are giving China so far, from the standpoint of materials arriving inside of China ready for warfare, is but a very sorry percentage of what we would like to make available. It is true we say in the report of the committee—and it is a unanimous opinion of the entire group—on page 4:

Inadequate as they are, lend-lease supplies now being flown into China exceed the amount of lend-lease supplies which were carried over the Burma Road for use in China.

That is sort of paraphrasing of a more famous statement given in more distinguished company one time. But since I am signatory to the statement, I think it only fair to all the country, to this Congress, and to China to say that we recognize that these supplies are seriously inadequate. One witness before our committee said they are, "Next to

nothing." Another one said, "They are a mere trickle." So while it is true, it is also a little tricky to say that, "More lend-lease supplies are being flown into China than were carried over the Burma Road for use in China," because so very, very few supplies were carried over the Burma Road to China from lend-lease activities. That is not the fault of the Administrator of Lend-Lease. It is not altogether the fault of the President. It is a difficulty arising out of a situation whereby the Burma Road being closed, transportation difficulties arise making it very difficult to get supplies from India to China, even after they have arrived in India from the United States.

So, as I say, my first suggestion deals with the Chinese situation, because I am one of those who feels with some of the witnesses appearing before our committee, that where there is a will there must always be a way to be of more material aid to China. I think one way presently available, although not being presently utilized to any great extent, is for this country, through its combined boards which make the final decision, to determine to start sending now some fighting planes to China, which can be flown all the way from this country to China, so that there are no transportation difficulties involved. All it requires is the will to put into Chinese hands without delay fighting planes which can be used in helping protect that great and gallant people against the attacks of the Japanese.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The C. N. A. C. in China is performing a great service in flying war matériel and personnel in. It may be easily done.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, indeed. I thank the lady for her observation. If we will make available, as some of the witnesses pointed out, some fighting planes to China—they now have the pilots ready to use them—it will stimulate their morale and will give them a hitting power in the air which they now lack, and I wish to emphasize the fact again there is nothing in the world except the failure to make a favorable decision preventing our sending those planes to China now. They could have been sent 6 months ago, 3 months ago, 6 weeks ago; still they are not being sent. I want to put in my individual plea, that while the emphasis seems to be on the war on the European front, at the same time we must not be entirely asleep to the great menace of Japan. The least we should do is to fly planes into China now, since no transportation difficulties are involved and even 1 day's output of our planes if sent to China by ferry command would pay inestimable dividends in this global war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield the gentleman 5 additional min-

utes. May I ask a question of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts will state her question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the Chair know how late we are going to run this afternoon? If I knew that, it would aid me in the yielding of time. I think the rule provides for 2 days of general debate and while I suppose it will finish this evening, yet as has happened in the past, there may be additional debate tomorrow. I know many Members would like to know how much time remains for general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised only that the rule provides for 2 days of debate. The debate will proceed until the Committee rises.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then it will be necessary to stay until late tonight if we are to finish, undoubtedly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised as to the number of requests for time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The rule provides for 2 full days of debate.

Mr. MUNDT. We will stay here until we finish the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that when the debate is finished the Chairman of the Committee will move that the Committee rise. Until that is done the present occupant of the chair will preside.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, quoting the persistent comment of the gentleman from Florida, JOE HENDRICKS, I hope this is not being taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Presiding Officer has no control over the hours of debate. The rule provides for 2 full days. The time is subject to control by the Chairman of the Committee and the ranking minority member.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would not the 2 full days of debate end whenever the House had its fill of debate? Then the 2 days would be over.

Mr. O'HARA and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement on aid to China, because he, in my opinion, points out what the administration should do; but let me ask the gentleman, the House itself, why other gentlemen, or myself, have not been asked or given opportunity to express ourselves as to the administration of lend-lease?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. And I think you will agree with me we should not be asked on matters of military policy. That, after all, involves a military decision to be made by the military authorities. In that connection may I suggest those decisions are not made by

Mr. Stettinius. The determination of who gets these planes is made by a highly complicated group of Boards and administrators who, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stated, give orders to Mr. Stettinius.

LEND-LEASE BOOKKEEPING

I want now to discuss my second observation, and that is the bookkeeping situation in connection with lend-lease. The accounts on our side are well and accurately kept and you have been supplied with the facts and figures concerning how much lend-lease has been appropriated, how much money has been authorized, where it has been allocated, and how it has been spent. These American accounts are in terms of dollars and cents. The difficulty arises because of the fact that we do not have this type of bookkeeping on the part of the other United Nations, since apparently lend-lease in reverse is written up in terms of socks, in terms of telephone wire, in terms of food, and in terms of blankets, rather than in terms of shillings or pounds or dollars and cents. Consequently there is considerable confusion as to how much lend-lease in reverse actually does add up to and as to how much of a two-way street lend-lease really has become.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true, that the duty of Congress is only to legislate; that the obligation of administration is entirely on the executive branch of the Government and does not rest on the Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. That is true, but I think the Congress has the duty and the obligation to keep a weather eye open on all of its administrative and executive associates.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The Congress has nothing to do with administering the act.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. All details and decisions of an administrative nature are determined by the President or those to whom he delegates his authority.

We have been unable until today, until the very hour the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], went on the floor of the House this afternoon and said that Mr. Stettinius had given him privately and he hoped he was not revealing a confidence when he made it available to the country, to determine the amount of lend-lease in reverse coming from Great Britain. Up until the time the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said Mr. Stettinius has given him this fiscal fact in private which he in turn relayed to the House our committee was unable to pry loose any specific figure or estimation as to the value of lend-lease in reverse. Today for the first time we are told that "it is crowding \$1,000,000,000." The thing that hurts me is that we could not have had that information brought out candidly and openly during the hearings of the committee rather than to have it relayed

to us indirectly at this time. However, I am happy that at long last in all events we are getting at a system of bookkeeping which we can all understand, because trying to compare billions of dollars of American money with socks, blankets, telephone wire, and tea coming from another country is a soul-perplexing task.

I hope our Appropriations Committee will follow through on the lead provided by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], with further inquiries as it examines the financial aspects of lend-lease, and tell us whether or not we cannot secure from the administration of lend-lease figures which are comparable in terms of shillings and pounds or dollars and cents, not for the purpose of trying to make a dollar-for-dollar adjustment, but for the purpose of being candid and honest and open and forthright with the American taxpayers, who after all pay the cost of lend-lease. I see no reason for confusing the issues and keeping one set of books in terms of dollars and cents and the other set of books in terms of socks and blankets. The British know how to keep books; the British are keeping books on their expenses, and they certainly know what each item is worth in terms of their own currency. They do not just keep books in terms of pairs of blankets, dozens of socks, or pounds of telephone wire; they keep books in terms of their own currency, and it is not a very difficult operation to translate pounds sterling and shillings into dollars and cents. The lend-lease bookkeeping system should be such on both sides that each can get the benefit of the system as we go along. I see no virtue in concealment and no value in unnecessary confusion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Congress should ask for an auditing of the books.

Mr. MUNDT. What is needed primarily is a frank and full accounting as we go along in terms that are understandable to all.

We have no question about the honesty of the other side; we are not questioning our own integrity; we are simply asking for the approximate figures so that we can give our citizens comparable figures, figures they can understand, instead of attempting to bewilder the people as to what lend-lease in reverse actually means. Nobody is complaining about the fact that we are extending this aid; we are simply asking that the facts be made available to the citizens who are paying the money and whose boys are doing the fighting. The way to do this is to evaluate reverse lend-lease in terms of monetary values where that is possible. Now I come to the relationship of lend-lease to the combined boards. I am not going to discuss it at great length because the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has gone into that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

LEND-LEASE AND THE COMBINED BOARDS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the members of the committee that for a rather interesting résumé of the way in which lend-lease operates relative to the combined boards you should read the hearings from page 337 to 340. I think you will find reading those hearings is a good deal like trying to explain a passage in Greek to a 12-year-old boy by translating it into Latin. It is a highly confusing interpretation, but it at least brings out the point made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. It is unfortunate that more of the United Nations are not represented on these combined boards of strategy, and I think it brings out as well that it is unfortunate that Mr. Stettinius has to take orders, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] says, and has not a little more determining power from the standpoint of giving orders. I will not go into that any further because there are one or two other matters I want to take up.

THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE AND LEND-LEASE

The following subject has to do with the Appropriations Committee of the House. I would like to point out, as has been said here previously, that the House Foreign Affairs Committee is a committee entrusted with the formulation of policy. It is a policy-making committee. It is not a financial or bookkeeping committee. It does not appropriate money. I think a tremendous responsibility is imposed upon the Appropriations Committee of this House to study carefully the requests for lend-lease, whatever those requests may be.

At the time of the hearings, the Lend-Lease Administrator told us he was unable to even make an estimate of how much more money would be requested. Of course that estimate is now in the process of being prepared. It will be presented to the Appropriations Committee and I urge you members of that committee to keep in mind when that time comes the fact that over \$63,000,000,000 have already been appropriated for lend-lease. There was some discussion about that earlier today, and I quoted from Mr. Stettinius' statement on page 64 of the report submitted to the Congress on January 25, 1943, known as House Document No. 57. You will find there the figure of over \$63,000,000,000 that has so far been appropriated for lend-lease.

May I point out that a billion dollars in American money is approximately \$8 per man, woman, and child in America. The average American family consists of five, which means that a billion dollars to a family of five is a debt of \$40. That \$63,000,000,000 means a family obligation of some \$2,500 which every family in America has invested in lend-lease. With that colossal figure staring us in the face I submit our Appropriations Committee has a very devout responsibility to the membership of this House and to the country to analyze carefully the requests coming in for additional

lend-lease funds and to find out something in terms of American dollars regarding the lend-lease in reverse that is coming back to us.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The gentleman states that \$63,000,000,000 has been authorized?

Mr. MUNDT. No. Sixty-three billion dollars has been appropriated, not authorized. That is the figure on page 64. If you will look at the testimony of Mr. Stettinius you will find that is the figure.

Mr. KEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. If the gentleman will refer to page 64 I would like for him to read to the House the statement made at the head of that page.

Mr. MUNDT. Page 64?

Mr. KEE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. "Recapitulation of aid authorized."

Mr. KEE. The next two lines.

Mr. MUNDT. "The amount of lend-lease that may be provided under the various acts is summarized as follows."

Mr. KEE. "That may be provided."

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and then let us read the next line, "Lend-lease appropriations to the President", and also the next line.

Mr. KEE. Appropriated to the present.

Mr. MUNDT. Right. Then the next black line, "Transfers authorized from other appropriations," and the next black line, "Value of ships which may be leased." A ship has to have an appropriation before it can be built or put to sea; certainly, before it can be leased.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman made the statement to the House that the total amount named was \$63,000,000,000.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. KEE. The statement on page 64 is distinctly to the effect that the amount is authorized, not appropriated.

Mr. MUNDT. No. The word "appropriated" is spelled out. We need not argue the language here. Any Member of Congress can read it and determine which of us is correct. Page 64, we agree, is the page on which it is found. The statements I have just quoted specifically say "appropriated." There can be no question about that.

LEND-LEASE AND FOODSTUFFS

I wish to discuss next the subject of foodstuffs. On pages 339, 340, and 341 we find a description of the manner in which foodstuffs are supplied to the British Empire. May I say at the beginning that I have no criticism particularly with the way in which those foodstuffs are supplied or handled. They are provided by this Government through lend-lease, free of charge to the British Government. The British Government sells the supplies to the British civilians. This money then goes back to the British exchequer and becomes a part of the general British fund and much of it is used in buying supplies to give our

soldiers in the camps abroad. But there again we have bewilderment and confusion in terms of what is actually lend-lease in reverse. The money thus accruing to the British treasury is a substantial amount, but until we get the figures anybody's guess is as good as anybody else's as to just how much it actually is.

But to a substantial extent, at least, our lend-lease in reverse is being paid for from money received by the British Exchequer from foodstuffs delivered to Britain free of charge under our lend-lease funds and then sold to the British public.

To that extent it follows that the American taxpayers are paying for so-called lend-lease in reverse. Since the foodstuffs and materials supplied our forces in Britain are listed by Major Spiegelberg as being included in what we receive from Britain as lend-lease in reverse it is only common candor to point out that as an offset against such accounting there should be included the money received by the British Government from the sale of foodstuffs which this country gives to Britain in the first instance.

Mr. Chairman, my plea here is not against the manner in which these foodstuffs are sold nor the method in which the monetary returns therefrom are handled. My plea is simply for less confusion and contradiction in the manner in which reports are given to the American taxpayer and for complete candor in listing the return benefits from lend-lease. Unquestionably we are securing some direct return benefits in terms of supplies and services as an offset against part of what we are spending for lend-lease; unfortunately these return benefits as yet are unknown in terms of dollar values and they are not as great as many had been given cause to hope for.

May I also point out, Mr. Chairman, that since lend-lease in the future seems to be planning to send less of the heavy materials of war, fewer tanks, and fewer guns proportionately, and since the export of foodstuffs seems destined to double or treble, there may be reason to reexamine the method by which our Government is reimbursed for foodstuffs sold for cash by those receiving it. To date, I feel no great injustice has been done, but, as shipments of food double or treble in size, it is possible a more equitable system of bookkeeping and of settling food accounts may become desirable. The Appropriations Committee may want to give consideration to this as it meets additional demands for added billions for lend-lease purposes. In fact, on page 341 of the hearings accompanying this resolution, Mr. Stettinius himself indicates that a different system might become desirable. Let me quote you the last paragraph of his report on the manner in which foodstuffs are supplied and sold under lend-lease. He says, on page 341 of the hearings:

One final point should, however, be emphasized. If the disposition of lend-lease goods results, at any time, in unjustified benefits to a foreign government, the Office of Lend-Lease Administration, acting with

the State Department, the Treasury, and other interested Government agencies, is empowered to, and will, reexamine the basis on which lend-lease aid is furnished and distributed and make such adjustments as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this Congress is one of those "other interested Government agencies." I submit we should examine the periodic 90-day reports of lend-lease in this connection. We should not and we must not try to drive a hard bargain with our allies in this war. I for one am glad we are able to supply them with materials of war, and I want them all, including Russia and China, to get all they require to defeat the Axis. However, you and I have a responsibility too, to protect the financial integrity of the United States. We must constantly measure our pattern by our cloth. The House Appropriations Committee primarily has that responsibility.

To have a realistic victory in this war we must have a solvent United States to which our fighting forces can return and which can play a vital part in the world after the war. With lend-lease already responsible for a \$2,500 mortgage on the home of every average-sized family in America the time has come when we must begin considering our own economic capacity and when sound patriotism requires that we at least maintain insofar as possible a comparable and relative solvency when compared with our partners in this war. If the formula is to be that each shall contribute as it can we must take stock to make certain that each is really doing what it can in order that after the war is over each can have a fair and equal opportunity to rehabilitate its domestic economy and to take its rightful place in world affairs.

LEND-LEASE AND FARM MACHINERY

Mr. Chairman, I come now to some observations concerning the operations of lend-lease in the export of farm machinery, a product in which this country even now is suffering a most serious shortage. I went into this subject at some length during the course of our committee hearings. Mr. Stettinius has convinced me that the desperate shortage of farm machinery from which this country now is suffering is not the responsibility of lend-lease operations. While some highly important farm machinery has been exported to Great Britain and to our other allies, the amount in terms of the percentage of our total production is not great. Furthermore, it is hoped this farm machinery will reduce demands upon this country for the exportation of foodstuffs in which we are already beginning to feel the pinch produced from a combination of unwise planning in the fields of farm labor, farm prices, production quotas, and the manufacture of farm machinery.

A word of explanation might be in order as to the method in which American farm machinery is distributed and used when it is sent abroad. Since Britain is the greatest recipient of our farm machinery, let us examine how American farm machinery is handled

when it arrives in Britain. This was brought out by questions which I asked Mr. Stettinius during our committee hearings. I quote from page 29 of the committee hearings:

Mr. MUNDT. Of the \$16,000,000 worth of farm machinery which has been lend-leased, \$3,500,000 has been sold. We understand how that has been handled. The other 13 million handled under lend-lease?

Mr. STETTINIUS. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. Is that loaned? Is that machinery you expect to bring back after the war, or what will happen to that after the war?

Mr. STETTINIUS. Under the master agreement with the United Kingdom that is spelled out. We have the option to take back any lend-lease supplies which are not destroyed, exhausted, or consumed. Actually we keep title to the tractors. The tractors are numbered and a full record is kept and that is a decision for others at a later date. The United States Government has the option under the master agreement to take them back or leave them.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; but the master agreement though seems to emphasize we will take back material which is primarily of value from the standpoint of our national defense.

Mr. STETTINIUS. No, sir. It can be machine tools, farm tools, agricultural implements, or anything.

Mr. MUNDT. Can you go into a little detail about that? Let us take an individual tractor manufactured by an American concern and purchased by American funds and loaned or leased to Britain. When it gets over there, how does it get to the individual farmer? Does that farmer get it through his Government free? Does he pay for it? If he pays for it, what happens to the money?

Mr. STETTINIUS. It is not sold. It is owned by the Government and, to us, the county agent would have assigned to him 10 tractors, say, for each given territory. Those tractors are kept working every hour they can. They are working them day and night. They are shifted from farm to farm. They are used in making airports one day and are used in road construction the next day and are used for plowing land the next day.

Mr. MUNDT. I am trying to interpret the relationship of the individual English farmer, John Doe, English farmer, who has an American lend-lease tractor. Does he pay anything for the use of the tractor?

Mr. STETTINIUS. No, sir. It is assigned to him by the Minister of Agriculture.

Thus it will be seen that American farm machinery is furnished free of charge to the English farmer. We charge him nothing for it. The British Government makes no charge for its use. It is a very substantial form of farm relief, made in America, for the English farmer. I find no fault with that, Mr. Chairman, but I think that this fact should be clearly pointed out, because some of the same metropolitan newspapers which are loudest in their unstinted and uncritical praise of the entire lend-lease program are also loudest and most vicious in their attacks upon the American farmer when he asks for justice from his Government. In fact, some of the same big eastern newspapers, which all too frequently seem to display more friendship for some foreign friend than they do for the American farmer, apparently divide their editorial space between singing huzzahs for lend-lease and making whining criticisms of the American farmer when he asks for fair prices for his products or

insists on securing either manpower or machinery so he can continue producing the food so vital to the winning of this war. It seems no more than simple justice and logic that a Government capable of providing substantial farm relief for foreign farmers should also be capable of providing a program for our domestic farmers which will enable them to stay on the farm and meet the problems of production arising from this war.

THE POSITION OF THIS CONGRESS IN LEND-LEASE

Mr. Chairman, one further observation and I am through. Probably the most important responsibility of this Congress relates to its position in the final settlements, benefits, and international agreements and policies stemming from lend-lease. A study of article VII of the master agreements and of section 3 (b) of the Lend-Lease Act reveals how far reaching these agreements and settlements may be and indicates the manner in which executive action, unless properly restrained by constitutional and congressional limitations, can determine a vast multitude of post-war trends and policies.

Throughout our hearings, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs sought and received assurances from Administration witnesses that the rather loose and unrestricted language of article VII of the Master Agreements intended no circumvention of the rights and powers of Congress. We were flatly told that Congress would be consulted and that no binding commitments would be made which were not based upon constitutional procedure and American tradition. We were also assured that not only was this understood by the executive department of this country but that all of the United Nations had been fully advised concerning the machinery by which Americans govern themselves and determine upon their foreign policy.

On page 120 of the hearings, for example, Dean Acheson of the State Department, made these matters emphatically clear. I quote a paragraph or two from my questioning of him concerning the language and intent of article VII of the Master Agreements.

Mr. ACHESON. That is one of things provided in article VII here where it says:

"At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments."

It says at an early convenient date conversations shall be begun between the two governments. And this is stated in all the agreements, and these conversations, it is also stated, are to be open to all other nations of like mind with a view to determining in the light of governing economic conditions the best means of obtaining the above-stated objectives.

Now, in these conversations we will obviously find out what the other nations are thinking and what, in the light of their governing economic conditions, they will be prepared to recommend to their constitutional legislative bodies. The result of this discussion will undoubtedly, and I hope, be a series of recommendations which will be made to the Congress or to the British Parliament

and to the Russian legislative organization, and so on. And at that point it will be debated and considered and acted upon by the Congress. But there is nothing in article VII which in any way controls or limits the Congress in the exercise of this constitutional power.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MUNDT, may I ask a question there?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; surely.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you connect this Lend-Lease Act up with any of these questions you are asking? The Lend-Lease Act, the way the Chair understands it, is merely for defense.

Mr. MUNDT. That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you connect the question or the answer with the Lend-Lease Act?

Mr. MUNDT. I will be very happy to answer that question. That is the thing that disturbed me. I understood, as we all did when the act passed the Congress, that it was supposed to be an act to promote the defense of the United States, and section III says that, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President can, from time to time, when he deems it in the best interests of the national defense, authorize—and so forth. But from what I understand yesterday from Mr. Acheson's own interpretation I think you said subsection E of section III, wasn't that it? in the interpretation of that, these master agreements were entered into as a sort of an understanding of the basis of settlement.

The CHAIRMAN. That is for a limited time.

Mr. MUNDT. That is after lease-lend was over. I would like to continue the question to Mr. Acheson, if I may, whether you do not feel there is a relationship between lend-lease per se and the master agreements?

Mr. ACHESON. Well, obviously the master agreements—

Mr. MUNDT. If we did not have the one, we would not have the other.

Mr. ACHESON. Well, obviously, the master agreements are made under the Lease-Lend Act.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; so that I think that answers the question about the relevancy of my questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right.

Mr. MUNDT. Now, is your interpretation, Mr. Acheson, of this paragraph you have just read to me, picking up where you stopped reading "in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of obtaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action," do you contemplate in any way that this agreed action is going to be taken by representatives of our executive department or of the various executive departments of the Government in these conversations?

Mr. ACHESON. No, Mr. MUNDT; the process, I think, as I have tried to describe it yesterday, is that the President is the authority under the Constitution which must conduct the negotiations with foreign nations. That he must do. There is no other authority to do it. And he has complete power in that field. When it comes to implementing any arrangement which he may negotiate, then we fall back on the constitutional framework provided in the fundamental charter.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is pretty clear to all of us.

Mr. ACHESON. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. As those conversations are taken up, has that been made crystal clear to all the conferees of other governments?

Mr. ACHESON. I do not think there is any question about the fact that all governments dealing with us understand thoroughly the framework of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the record might be clear as to the understanding of your committee on this important

matter, we have included in our committee report, which has been signed unanimously, a summation of the understanding given us during these hearings by administration witnesses with regard to the intent and the import of article VII and the powers expected to be utilized under that article of the master agreements and under section 3 (b) of the Lend-Lease Act. I now quote this portion of the unanimous committee report to you as it is found in various paragraphs of pages 12, 13, and 14 of the report. I think Members of the Congress and citizens throughout the country should familiarize themselves with this interpretation since at this time no one can predict with accuracy what President or which administration will be charged with the responsibility of winding up the affairs of lend-lease and it is imperative that the position and responsibility of Congress be clearly understood by one and all. I quote now from our unanimous committee report:

Article VII does not in any way alter the constitutional relationship of Congress and the President in the field of economic policy. It does not reduce tariff barriers, nor remove discriminations, nor set up machinery to secure an expansion of employment, production, and consumption. It does, however, bind the signatories to confer together, with all other countries of like mind, to determine the best means of attaining the economic objectives which it sets forth. Those conversations will concern all the subjects dealt with in article VII, without limitation or exception. The results of the negotiations undertaken in accordance with this provision are then to be referred for action to the proper constitutional authority in each of the countries concerned.

Your committee desires to state at this point that an important portion of the time spent in the hearings upon this bill, in both open and executive session, has been devoted to a thorough discussion of the functions to be performed by the Congress in connection with the final agreements to be entered into by the United States and other nations, flowing from the operations of this act or further developments arising from this war. In those discussions your committee has been assured by responsible representatives of the State Department and others holding positions of authority in the executive branch of the Government that, in their judgment, all agreements of a permanent nature with other nations flowing from this act and post-war developments, must of necessity be handled in accordance with the normal course of our constitutional procedure. Confident that it is the intent of the Congress as well as the administration that the constitutional procedure pursued since the beginning of our Government shall continue to prevail, your committee stands ready to cooperate in any and every effort to achieve a peace which shall bless us and our descendants. The proposals for forward action in the economic field contemplated by article VII must be handled in accordance with the normal course of our constitutional procedure, by statutes, treaties, or executive agreements, as may prove proper. The powers of the Senate in the field of treaties are unimpaired, as are those of the Congress in the field of legislation. Section 3 (b) of the act clarifies the President's essential Executive powers in the administration of the lend-lease program.

Mr. Chairman, if constitutional government is to survive and function in

this country it is imperative that this Congress retain and exercise the prerogatives which rightfully belong to it.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, eternal vigilance has rightfully been called the price of liberty. Eternal vigilance is also the price of the wise and effective utilization of the Lend-Lease Act. I urge you to vote for its extension today and I urge you, also, to extend your attention to lend-lease in the days to follow so that it may helpfully bring victory in this war and work to provide for future peace.

Wisely and prudently operated, lend-lease can contribute greatly to our early victory and to post-war settlements of merit.

Recklessly or arrogantly operated, lend-lease can carry us far toward national insolvency and contribute to distrust among our United Nations and disunity and disillusionment at home.

Congress should extend this act, but Congress should not then retire from its responsibilities and assume that all is well and that victory has been guaranteed and a better world assured.

Let us examine carefully the regular lend-lease reports with friendly firmness.

Let us offer our constructive suggestions when and where they will be most effective.

Let us expose errors so as to command corrections.

Let us require the Appropriations Committee of the House to report to us, fully, as to the additional requirements of lend-lease and the impact of those requirements upon our national solvency and the formula of asking each nation allied with us in this war to contribute in accordance with its means to the joint victory which we all shall win.

Let us proceed without prejudice, passion, or partisanship to work together—executive and legislative branches of this Government—to secure the wise and prudent operation of lend-lease and of every other agency and armament of war so that victory may be won and peace secured with the least possible loss of life, of time, of money, and of liberty for one and all.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the unanimity of sentiment as expressed in the debate on the resolution now under discussion, it would seem to be unnecessary to waste the time of the House by discussing the merits of the measure. That the so-called Lend-Lease Act passed by the Congress and approved on March 11, 1941, has proven to have been not only a measure of foresight and wisdom, but that it also initiated the most effective policy we could have adopted in the cause of national defense seems to be now conceded even by those who most earnestly opposed the passage of the original act. That the administration of this act by those in responsible charge of the execution of its provisions has been, in the larger sense, wise, judicious, and worthy of approval, was convincingly shown in evidence be-

fore your Foreign Affairs Committee during our exhaustive hearings on the resolution now under consideration. That reciprocal lend-lease, or lend-lease in reverse, whereby the nations which have been beneficiaries under the act have reciprocated by furnishing much needed and substantial aid to the United States armed forces, has been and is a benefit of tremendous importance to our cause, is an undisputed fact. That not only is it to the interest of this Nation, but is in fact necessary to our national defense, as well as to the success of the offensive plans of our armed forces that our lend-lease policy be continued, seems to be generally acknowledged. This being the instant situation, it would seem to serve but little if any purpose for us to now debate at length the question of extending the act, as provided by the pending resolution. This resolution should and no doubt will be adopted by the unanimous vote of this body.

In connection with the matter before us, however, and because of the position of leadership now held by our country, attained in part through our lend-lease policy and due to be maintained by a continuance of that policy, I am convinced that the question of the advisability of immediate action on the part of our Government in the matter of entering into agreements with members of the United Nations and other sovereign nations to establish, at the close of the war, a lasting and enduring peace is a subject germane to the issue now before us. A resolution bearing on this question, to which I will later refer, is now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs for consideration. While I would not urge nor even suggest the use of our lend-lease policy for bargaining purposes, yet I do urge most earnestly the fact that our present position of world leadership, a position we will certainly maintain by reason, in part at least, of the extension of the Lend-Lease Act, places us in an advantageous position for at once opening negotiations for agreements on post-war settlements.

The people of the United States, as well as the peoples of the other members of the United Nations, should know what to expect when their victory has been won. This knowledge can only be assured through mutual agreements made and entered into before hostilities are ended. It is my firm conviction that immediate action should be taken on the part of the United States and the several other United Nations toward establishing now a mutual understanding for the settlement of post-war problems. I believe that such an understanding between the several United Nations is presently imperative because it will not only result in bringing about greater unity and added strength to our cause but it will also assure to the world a lasting peace. On the other hand, I am just as firmly convinced that if we fail to reach an understanding with our allies before the end of the war, we will not only, as we did at the close of World War No. 1, sacrifice our hopes for an enduring peace, but when the war has been

won, we will find ourselves in a world of hopeless chaos and confusion.

The United Nations will win the war. Of this our minds cannot entertain the slightest doubt. The issues are too great and the consequences of our defeat would be too disastrous to permit us to envision failure. Lend-lease will continue to be a vital factor and to play a most important part in our efforts on every front. We will win at a staggering cost of men and money and individual sacrifice. We will not count the cost. Why should we? Freedom is precious and having once won the right to stay free, we can and will start over again with clean though perhaps empty hands to build for ourselves a new world.

The building of this world of tomorrow, however, cannot be safely undertaken until we have first laid the foundations of a peace so secured and established that all the world will have the assurance that it will endure through countless generations yet to come. The fact that this must be done has been impressed upon us by bitter experience. A victory, however complete over those who would destroy us, is not enough. An unconditional surrender of the forces now battling against us is not enough. A present and complete disarmament of our enemies is not enough. Neither can we safely build on pledges, promises, and treaties, however solemnly made.

Experience has taught us that a decision arrived at by force of arms is not final. A surrender of enemy armies, however desirable, necessarily and inevitably imposes heavy burdens and responsibilities upon the victor and implies no assurances for the future. Disarmament today does not insure against rearmament tomorrow, and the recent years have been replete with instances of broken promises, violated pledges and repudiated treaties on the part of nations, regardless of their so-called national honor.

That nothing real, vital, lasting, or beneficial to the world was accomplished by the First World War will be conceded. Motivated by the highest ideals the American people entered into that war and devoted every resource to its successful conclusion. The victory won by us was complete. Our reward was exactly nothing.

At the close of World War No. 1, we had everything in our hands—just as we will when we win the victory in the present conflict. We knew then as we know now the character of the people we were fighting. We knew then, as we know now, that a lasting peace could not be established on their words of pledge or promise. We knew then, or we should have known, that an enduring peace could only be assured through the establishment, by and with the cooperation of all liberty-loving nations, of an agency clothed with power to prevent a breach of world peace on the part of any nation refusing to settle its grievances by peaceful means and resorting instead to violence or war. Yet, knowing this, we let the opportunity pass. The world now knows the result. In less than 20 years

Germany, a nation we had beaten to her knees, rose to undreamed of power and soon plunged the world into the bloodiest war in human history.

Are we going to repeat our mistakes of 25 years ago? Are we going to wait until we win the victory in this war and then either rest upon the mere laurels of victory and plunge the world, as we did then, into a quarrel over the spoils, or shall we, pending our final victory, join with the other members of the United Nations in an agreement under which we will this time establish a peace that will last into the dawns of future years?

Such an agreement can be as broad and comprehensive as the leaders of the United Nations see fit to make it, but whatever else is included, there must be a provision for a world agency clothed with authority to determine all controversies between nations. To make such an agency effective, it must also necessarily be clothed with power to enforce its decrees, not only against any of the nations who are parties to the agreement, but also against any nation refusing to submit its controversies to the agency for settlement.

It may be argued that such a provision involves the use of force and that the use of force against a sovereign nation is opposed to the principles of democracy. This is not a true concept of either democratic principles or processes. No social order could survive for a day without the means to enforce rules of human conduct. No nation could survive without a method to enforce its laws. No union of nations can effectively function without power to enforce the decisions of its tribunals.

It is true that an ideal world would be one in which national honor is held to be infinitely more precious than national profit. If we could have a world in which every nation functioned under the unchanging leadership of those by whom treaties, pledges, and promises were held sacred and binding—a leadership in whom all the world could place implicit faith and confidence—then indeed could we safely submit our destiny to treaties pledging the national honor. We have not now and never have had such a world. In dealing with nations we have always through bitter experience found the necessity, as in dealing with individuals, of having some means of compelling the fulfillment of obligations. If we fail to establish such means as a part of our post-war adjustment, we will have won a fruitless victory and our hopes of a lasting peace will have been in vain.

The fact that the people of the United Nations, including our own, are entitled to know just what to expect in the way of an international readjustment after they have successfully defended their right to exist has already been mentioned. They are entitled to the assurance that the mistakes following the previous World War will not be repeated. They need and are entitled to a guaranty that this war will result in something better than a Versailles Treaty impossible of enforcement, a tripartite

agreement subject to convenient repudiation, a nine-power contract with no binding obligations, or a Kellogg-Briand Pact expressive of high ideals but voidable at will. Above all, the people want assurances of a peace subject neither to disturbance nor breach. Give them this assurance now and they will joyfully and confidently fight on to victory in the common cause.

It has long been established that self-preservation is the first law of nature. Security, therefore, both personal and national, is the chief object and desire of every nation in the world. A lasting peace spells lasting security, and the problem of establishing this security is bound to confront the peace conference when the war has ended.

Sir Norman Angell, the distinguished English diplomat and winner in 1933 of the Nobel Peace Prize, writing of the peace conference of the First World War, says:

Again and again at the peace conference this sort of situation arose:

A nation would claim territories which obviously did not belong to it. On behalf of justice, and so of peace, it was asked to forego the claims. The claimant would then point out that by including this alien territory, it got things necessary for defense—an easily defended frontier, raw material—adding in effect this: "If we make the frontier as the conference desires, we shall be weak, open to attack. If we accede to your request, and then, as the result of our consequent weakness, we are attacked, will you defend us?" The answer was usually a mumble of a decisive "No." "In that case," in effect replied the claimant in question, "we shall stick to our demand for this territory and this strategic frontier, even if it does strain the principle of nationality. Survival comes first, self-preservation is the law of life. The precondition of peace or justice is security."

Is it not safe, then, for us to assume that unless we now, before the close of this war, assure all of our associates and Allied Nations of a security guaranteed by agreements necessary to establish a permanent peace, we will inevitably be confronted at the conference table by similar situations as that above described? Our failure to make this provision in advance will certainly increase the post-war demands of the several nations—demands to which it may not be possible to accede.

While, as heretofore stated, I do not favor nor suggest that we use lend-lease for bargaining purposes, yet the policy we are now following and will continue to pursue under the Lend-Lease Act must certainly favorably affect our present relations with our associate nations in the United Nations compact. At the moment, and until the close of this war, the United States of America is and will continue to be the natural leader of the United Nations and so looked to by every nation bound in the covenant against the Axis Powers. The various nations so united in a common cause are now not only looking to us for military leadership and direction, but they are also looking to us for military supplies and other materials of war. They are also objects of our bounty in the matter of food, clothing, medicines, and medical supplies, as

well as other necessities of life, all freely furnished under the lend-lease program. These nations are today our friends as well as our allies. Our soldiers and sailors, and theirs, are fighting side by side, and our civilian population, and theirs, are working in sympathy and understanding for a common objective—the total defeat of a common enemy. While the war is still in progress, this situation will remain unchanged. That is, we will be the leader and the other nations will continue to sense the obligations they are under to us for the valuable not to say indispensable help we are giving. Right now is the time when any proposal for an understanding between us upon post-war problems will receive friendly and sympathetic consideration.

For example, Russia is fighting the Axis desperately and effectively and is rendering a tremendous service to the free peoples of the world. Regardless of our lack of approval of Russia's form of government and our open opposition to any attempt to have a like form imposed upon us here, we are backing Russia in her gallant and courageous fight to maintain her sovereignty and her territorial integrity. In her fight she is using American arms and her soldiers are partly supplied with American foods, medicines, and medical supplies. She will need more and more American aid before the war is over. Is it not perfectly clear that Russia would now be in the mood to welcome the opportunity to join with the United States and other members of the United Nations in a fair and equitable agreement in which our post-war plans are clearly and openly defined? On the other hand, with the war once ended, is it not equally clear that we will have a victorious Russia, her millions and their leaders exultant in their triumph and filled with the pride of their achievement? Under these changed conditions what will be Russia's attitude or Russia's demands when called into a conference at which the destiny of the world is the stake? To what extent will her demands have multiplied after she has won through to security, has been freed from fear and is no longer dependent upon us for assistance? And further, while the war is in progress, a large majority of the American people are willing to forego their prejudices against Russia's communistic government and to approve the aid we are sending her. Let the war end, however, and how many of our citizens will then be disposed to agree to any proposed concessions to Russia in the post-war settlement—concessions that must inevitably be made if any agreement is to be reached?

We will be confronted with a more or less similar situation in all of the nations joined in the covenant of the United Nations and especially in the nations to the south of us. In my humble judgment, one of the greatest achievements of our truly great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was the initiation of the Habana Conference culminating in the signing of a pact of amity and solidarity between the nations of the

Western Hemisphere. For many long years our southern neighbors have entertained a feeling of fear and distrust against the United States to which years ago they gave the name the Colossus of the North. Undoubtedly, this feeling, perhaps born of a distrust of the Monroe Doctrine, was kept alive and accentuated by German propaganda continuously circulated throughout all that region over a period of many years. With the rise of Hitler to power, and the threat of his coalition to the peace and security of the world, our southern neighbors were quick to realize the protective value of our friendship.

It was not perhaps that they feared us less, but they feared the Nazis more. The good-neighbor policy extended to them our open hand, which, under existing conditions, they were glad to grasp. They became our friends and our allies and are our friends today. We are proud of that friendship. But what will be the attitude of these neighbors, from Mexico to Chile, if and when the war ends without any understanding or agreement with us upon post-war problems? They will then have safely passed through the great crisis. They will no longer be in need of our protection nor of our aid and assistance. They will have their freedom, their independence, and their sovereignty assured. Will these nations, so freed from their peril and from their dependence upon the northern colossus, be as reasonable to deal with then as they are today? Or will they likely forget past favors and insist upon concessions far beyond what they would ask now? The question should be easily answered by anyone who knows human nature or who is familiar with the temperament of our brothers to the south.

The world can do nothing toward the establishment of the "four freedoms" throughout the length and breadth of every land until in every land there is established law, order, and peace—not temporarily, but to endure. Law is a rule of human conduct prescribed by the supreme power of a state. There is no supreme power to lay down nor enforce a rule of conduct for nations. Such a rule can only be formulated through agreements between nations. Without such agreements we can neither establish nor enforce a law of nations; without law, no order; without order, no peace; without peace, no security; without security, no hope to have, all over the world, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, or freedom from fear. These are the priceless things we are fighting to win. They should be the prizes of our victory. Is there any reason, then, why all the nations now united in a covenant to fight side by side until victory is achieved should not now enlarge this covenant to the end that their nationals, as well as all the world, may know that we will not win this war on land and sea and in the clouds only to lose it at the conference table?

In this connection I desire to call the attention of Members of the House to a resolution designated as House Joint Resolution 70 I recently introduced in

this body and that is now before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for consideration. Summed up briefly, the resolution advises the President that it is the sense of Congress, in order to secure and maintain law, order, and peace among the nations of the world, it is imperative that binding agreements be entered into between the members of the United Nations, as well as with other sovereign nations, without delay and without waiting for the war to end. The resolution does not set out the terms to be incorporated in the proposed agreements, except only that any agreement shall contain a provision for the establishment of an arbitral, judicial, or other agency empowered not only to settle controversies between nations, but also with power to adopt measures to compel a submission to it of all such controversies for settlement. Under this resolution the character and composition of the agency or tribunal to be established to maintain peace, as well as the measures to be adopted to enforce submission to the agency of national controversies, would be left for the joint determination of the President and the representatives of the several nations joining in the covenant. I hope for an early and favorable action on the resolution. We are traveling down a long, hard road and more light should be thrown on the end of the way. God knows that we should not move to that end in darkness and confusion.

The United Nations are today banded together for mutual defense against a common enemy. Their agreement is based upon the principles formulated by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill and set forth in the Atlantic Charter. This agreement must be supplemented by a new and broader understanding from which the world will know now that, united in toil, struggle, battle, and sacrifice, this union of nations intends to win both the war and the peace and make that peace as enduring as the everlasting hills.

High on the summit of the Andes Mountains, on the boundary lines between Chile and Argentina, there stands that heroic statue of the Christ, erected to commemorate the peaceful settlement of a long standing controversy between the two countries. On the base of the statue is graved these words, spoken by the bishop of Chile at its dedication:

Sooner shall these mountains crumble in the dust than the peoples of Argentina and Chile shall forget the peace they have sworn at the foot of Christ, the Redeemer.

So should endure the peace we must plan today and win tomorrow.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is much I can add to the subject that has been under discussion for the last couple of days on the floor of this House. It has been very widely covered, in my opinion. However, I should like to make one or two observations.

To my mind, when the Congress of the United States 2 years ago passed the original Lend-Lease Act, it was a signal to the world that Congress and the American people had decided that the war going on in Europe was not a war that was localized insofar as that continent was concerned but was a battle to the death between two ideologies, the ideology of the dictator nations and the ideology of democracy.

We also concluded at that time, the Congress speaking for the American people, that the termination of that war in a victory for the dictator nations would be a direct threat to the peace and security of this Nation.

The passage of this Lend-Lease Act, of course we all know now, and everybody is agreed on it, has had a tremendous effect upon the economy of this country and upon the final determination of which ideology shall be victorious.

One of the first and important effects was the determination that as far as this country was concerned the matter of dollars and cents or the matter of cash consideration was not to be considered, insofar as the Congress of the United States or the Treasury of the United States or the economy of the United States was concerned.

Up until the time of the passage of the Lend-Lease Act private industry in this country had been producing a great amount of war material and munitions of war, which were sold for cash to whatever nation in the world had cash. There was no correlation whatever as to whom these munitions should go, to what part of the globe they should go, or in what theater or field of operations they should be utilized, with the exception of a very small control in the way of the control over exports. But we did away with that remote control insofar as shipping was concerned and, by the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, channeled production of all war material and all munitions of war through the United States Government, so that the United States Government through the administration of lend-lease from that day on had complete control and charge of the production and distribution of all materials of war.

One of the great benefits of this act was the effect it had on the acceleration of the process of conversion of industry in this country from peacetime to wartime production. It had a very great effect in that respect, because if this country had gone along merely having private enterprise produce those materials of war which could be paid for by other nations the process of conversion to a wartime production basis would have been very, very much smaller. Of course, at the time this act was originally passed there was in the minds of a great many people in this country, in the minds of a great many Members of Congress, and I am sure in the mind of the Executive of this Nation, the hope that when we decided to give all the material aid it was possible for us to give to those who were fighting the dictators, that material aid would be sufficient to defeat

the Axis Nations, and that by defeating the Axis Nations with the help of the material resources of this country it would be unnecessary for our own boys to be involved in this conflict. In other words, it was sincerely hoped that this material aid would have the effect of keeping this Nation out of the war.

That hope was not realized. When on December 7, 1941, Japan made its sneak attack upon us at Pearl Harbor, most likely made at the direction of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, that hope was gone. Then we had to accept the challenge that was given to us, and we decided then and there that we would go all out for war.

I think now everybody is convinced that the operations of the lend-lease procedure are absolutely vital and essential to cooperation among the various Allied and United Nations. I have not heard of a single person or organization or even a publication that has opposed the extension of the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, so I believe we are all agreed on that particular point.

May I remind the Congress that when we accepted the war that was thrust upon us, we in our resolution accepting that war and declaring war on the dictator nations did not say, "We will go into this war with a portion of our resources or a fraction of our might," or "We will help out our allies," or "We will do so much and so much." In our resolution declaring war this Congress pledged all the resources of the United States to bring this war to a successful conclusion, all the resources, not just a little bit.

Therefore, I fail to see why so much time is spent on the floor of this House and in discussions all over the country about how much money the United States is spending in carrying out the determination of the people of this country to go forward to victory.

I have heard hours of debate about the money value of this and the money value of that. May I remind the Congress, and especially the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that we have decided, and I thought unanimously, that we never expect to get a return in dollars and cents for every cent we spend, so I feel that the discussion over the amount of money we are spending on this thing is altogether beside the point.

When the Lend-Lease Act was passed, it was decided that aid should be given to any nation whose defense the President deemed vital and necessary to the defense of our own country. That is the consideration, the defense of our own country. When we passed this act, we said in the first place it was an act to promote the defense of the United States. That is all the more reason why I do not see why we are spending so much time on the amount of money it is costing us.

Mr. Chairman, of course this act is up for renewal, and I am happy that there is practically unanimous opinion on the part of the Members of Congress that it should be extended for 1 year; but I also call attention to the disposition on the part of some persons to pick flaws

here and there, and sort of intimate that things could be a little different for the benefit of our own country. Some people, of course, want to improve things. They like to say, "Well, that might be improved in such and such a way." I think one of the suggested amendments is to the effect that any agreement that is made by the Executive branch of the Government, before final determination is made, shall come to this Congress for our approval. This sounds rather nice, it sounds as if it would be easy to bring an agreement into the Congress, and get the approval of the Congress, especially if it is a smart and a wise agreement. I am certain that if the Congress will stop for a minute and see what it will mean to place in this act a provision that any agreement entered into before its final settlement, shall go to the Congress for final approval, it will decide it is the most impractical and useless proviso you could possibly put into the bill. In the first place, there has been under the title of this act four different types of agreements entered into by the Lend-Lease Administration, or rather by the State Department. As you perhaps know, a portion of the authority granted under this act has been given to the State Department insofar as negotiations and entering into agreements with other nations are concerned. There are four types of agreements.

I call attention first to one type of agreement, known as the special agreements with the South American countries. The hearings will show that the United States entered into 17 of these agreements, very much alike in character, but providing in a way perhaps different commitments on the part of this country, and in turn, different commitments on the part of the South American countries. It may not be long before the commitments made by this country and by the South American countries, or a good portion of them, may have been finally consummated. Suppose these agreements should necessarily have to be brought to Congress for final determination or approval. The agreements have been practically negotiated and signed, and then suppose that the Congress should restrict the provisions and say, in respect to our South American neighbors, "You have an agreement with the Government of the United States signed by the Secretary of State, but it does not mean anything because Congress says that that agreement must be brought back to Congress to have its terms approved." Would that not be a nice kettle of fish for us to be in, if our representative would be compelled to say that this is not a final agreement, that this is a temporary agreement, and if Congress does not like it they can upset it. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, do you think our State Department with any such provision in this bill could possibly go to a country and make any agreement with them? It would be impossible for the State Department to operate under such a provision, especially with respect to the South American countries.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would not the gentleman say, while we are not permitted to discuss any of the terms of the 17 South American agreements, yet in the hearings it is clear that they are in themselves at present signed agreements.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They are final agreements.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And would not the gentleman agree that no law which we could pass now would interfere with the finality of the agreements if they were valid when originally made?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would say to the gentleman this, In respect to any agreement entered into by the State Department with the South American countries, if we should then pass a measure that the final determination of the agreement, entered into by the authority of the original act, is subject to final approval of Congress, that the South American countries would have a right to be very suspicious of us, and it would engender a lot of suspicion and give cause for many factions in these South American countries to say, "Here comes our great, big, rich neighbor from the north down here wanting to make agreements, wanting to make installations, and do various other things for her own defense, and yet we cannot depend on these agreements, because later the Congress might upset them."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is quite possible that such agreements are prompted by a laudable desire to maintain the integrity and independence of the Congress, but is there not another consideration? Do we not interfere with our executive department in conducting the war, and do we not give the appearance of division to foreign nations, and impair the prestige of our executive department in conducting the war, by insisting on such crippling amendments?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am very glad the gentleman brought that to my attention. Another type of agreement that has been entered into because of the authority granted to the Executive by the Lend-Lease Act is what is known as the 10 master agreements. Those agreements can be said in some respects to be final, because some of them have been finally agreed upon by the United States and these other 10 signatory powers, to the effect that certain considerations shall be entered into and certain commitments made. Flowing out of the lend-lease operations of this bill naturally we hope that when peace does come to the United Nations, it will be a victorious peace, and when final determination of all benefits under the Lend-Lease Act that ought to have been made, have been made, what then will be the result?

The final result, the natural benefits and everything else will be set forth in treaties between the sovereign country of the United States and other sovereign nations. Here we attempt to put into this act a clause that would give the House of Representatives the right to approve or disapprove treaties. It would be absolutely useless. It would be impractical. It would be an attempted usurpation of authority, because it would not have any effect. It would try to restrict the President, who has the power under the Constitution to negotiate treaties. A clause like that would simply hamstring the President and would do nothing but harm. The Senate is the body which advises and consents in treaties which have been negotiated by the President. Not the House.

Another type of special agreement has been made with Great Britain wherein we have obtained patent rights and we give them the benefit of our patents and formulas and secret processes, and Great Britain does the same for us. Those agreements might be said to be final in their determination. Would you put a clause in here that the Congress should ratify that? The same is true with reference to waiver of maritime rights under the universally recognized maritime decisions and laws. Certain final agreements have been made on that subject. We could go on and on and on and show how impractical this nice-sounding little clause is, that all agreements are subject in their final determination to the approval of Congress.

As I said in the first place, it would be impractical. It would be useless. It would throw a monkey wrench into the machinery. It would be an attempted usurpation of authority, without any authority under the Constitution of the United States or any of the precedents that we ever had. So I am appealing to the membership who have had an opportunity to look into this question a little to try to think about and see the repercussions that a catch amendment might have if adopted, without giving proper consideration to it.

Of course, another amendment has been suggested. It sounds all right. It says something to the effect that we should make an agreement with all these nations that receive lend-lease aid, to the effect that none of these weapons or munitions of war shall be used by any country receiving them to suppress the right of those people to choose the form of government they desire to live under. Now, that sounds good. Of course, after the lend-lease items or munitions of war that we give to any country—we do not want them to use them to suppress the rights of their people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. We do not want those weapons used to suppress the rights of the people of any country to choose the type of government under which they want to live. But what would that mean to this country?

Would that mean that we would first try to make an agreement with every nation? Naturally every nation would say, "Well, is that any of your business what kind of government we want? Suppose we want one and your Congress should not agree with it." You are immediately in a lot of trouble. Would you want to designate which particular weapon should be used for this purpose or that purpose? In other words, if the United States wants to become embroiled in the internal affairs of every other nation with whom we are now friendly, adopt the amendment which would say "No lend-lease articles shall be used for the suppression of people who want to be governed as they see fit." We would be sticking our noses into the internal affairs of every nation with whom we are now friendly. We would have to go in and police their elections under that sort of an amendment. We would have to see how their military are conducting their training, to see whether it is a suppression of the aims of the people. Also see how the civilian economy is going to be regulated.

So while some of the proposed amendments sound very nice and sound very practical, I hope that when they are before the House for consideration you will think a little deeper and think of the implications which they may contain. I have heard no general support of any such amendments and I hope there will be no general support of any such amendments. I hope that the bill, merely for the extension of this act for 1 year, will be passed without any crippling amendments, because it has been proven by all the testimony that it has worked about as near perfectly as any human instrumentality can make it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Has the gentleman any objection to the provision in section 4 of the Lease-Lend Act which requires an undertaking now that no nation which receives lease-lend aid will transfer those articles without consent?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Oh, I have no objection whatsoever to that. That is in the law right now as a protection to this country. We have supervision at the present time, so that those materials of war are not transferred unless they have the consent of this country while we are working in cooperation in an attempt to secure victory for the cause of the United Nations and civilization. I am sure the gentleman is in accord with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1776 was enacted when we were not at war. It was a new departure in legislation. While it is true that there have been previous wars in which allies gave mutual aid to each other in the nature of supplying associate nations with the implements of war, I have heard of no

instance in which a nation not at war passed such legislation to aid nations in the conflict. The act itself provides in section 1:

That this act may be cited as "An act to promote the defense of the United States."

That is the real title of the act, yet, if it were referred to under that title, I wonder how many people in the United States would know that reference was being made to what they know only as the Lend-Lease Act.

At the time the act was passed it was readily referred to as the Lend-Lease Act, and yet those who made some study of the bill realized that there was little likelihood of repayment in dollar exchange, goods, or services.

Except insofar as we can salvage what is left of defense articles on the cessation of hostilities, it is now an accepted fact by all familiar with its terms that there will be no tangible benefits accruing to the United States, regardless of how great have been our contributions for the use of other nations in the war effort.

It is now realized by those who understand the act that lend-lease shipments are in the nature of a contribution to civilization; that this contribution is not measured in terms of dollars but that each nation is expected to make its contribution in blood and toil in accordance with its means.

Others have said that the continued existence of the British Empire, or rather let me say the United Kingdom, as a free nation is essential to the continued existence of the United States as a free nation, and that therefore whatever we may lend-lease to the United Kingdom or the British Empire is for our own preservation and could not therefore constitute an indebtedness to us by the British Empire.

Now that we are in this global war because we were attacked and had no choice but to fight or surrender, these concepts seem logical and irrefutable. Should anyone disagree with this procedure and objective, he is immediately met with the realistic condition that this must and will be the basis and formula for our aid to the Allied cause as the arsenal of democracy.

However, under this concept the title "lend-lease bill" is a misnomer. We would be more realistic if we amended the title to read "war-aid bill." I wonder how many of the American people have the true concept of our status under the lend-lease bill. They are entitled to know the facts. They should not be under the impression that there is to be repayment of some kind when such is not the fact. They should be acquainted with the fact that lend-lease constitutes aid to our allies in addition to our own war bill, which will soon amount to \$100,000,000,000 a year and that up to this time we have already appropriated in the nature of aid to our allies under lend-lease, \$60,000,000,000 for their use in the common effort.

I am sure the American people will approve of this amendment to extend the act for 1 year if they have the true picture, as we are all agreed to win the

war no matter what the cost. If on the other hand they are encouraged to believe that this is a lend-lease bill and there is to be repayment of some kind, tangible or intangible, it would be a serious let-down to be apprised of the true situation when it is over.

The term "lend-lease" is misleading, first because in lending or leasing our money or property we can afford to be and generally are more liberal and in-different on the theory that it will come back to us in some form or other. If on the other hand it is given away in the nature of a contribution, even in a life-and-death cause, there must be and naturally is more concern as to how much we are contributing and what shape we will find ourselves in after having deprived ourselves of our money and property after the danger is passed.

This is true even though we know the American people want to spare no costs or sacrifice in winning the war; they have a right to feel that insofar as is possible in the exigencies and waste of war, every dollar of lend-lease that goes into the hand of an ally must be used for defense purposes and to the best advantage.

In the second place, it is, of course, impossible to more than roughly estimate the relative and reciprocal burdens to be borne by the individual nations to each other. Nor do we want to be too particular about doing more than our share. Nevertheless, there is a ceiling somewhere as to our contribution to the war effort. In other words, we are not going to win this war by merely spending money or throwing it at our allies.

Third, neither must we be deluded by the thought that we will receive back through lend-lease in reverse practically what we put into lend-lease. The public is given that impression in the columns of the daily papers. In my district in the columns of the daily papers appear the following statements, and others which I presume are typical all over the United States, and are given wide publicity:

Debtor nations have furnished housing, food, convoys, and other facilities to our soldiers overseas. In fact, the officials gave the impression that the amounts owed to Uncle Sam will be rather small if the war lasts several years or more.

And here is another one:

The reverse action of lend-lease is revealed by the statement that the United States forces in the United Kingdom have spent only \$1,000,000 on commercial purchases there.

Such propaganda, of course, reveals nothing of the true picture and is indeed misleading.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. They say this matter of reverse lend-lease is a 50-50 proposition. It reminds me of the old recipe for rabbit sausage, half horse and half rabbit—one horse and one rabbit.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think the gentleman has used a fair simile.

It is true that lend-lease officials and others said they were unable to give any,

or even approximate figures in dollars and cents as to the volume of lend-lease in reverse. In other words, what we received in return for lend-lease thus far. However, I am satisfied in my own mind from unofficial information checked with the information given the committee that our contribution to lend-lease in matériel, as compared with that of our allies to us, will run nearer a ratio of a thousand dollars to one than that it will nearly balance each other as above stated.

There can be little doubt that the Seventy-eighth Congress has a mandate from the people to reduce nonessential expenditures. We are seeking to carry out this mandate. But in a larger sense, unless the reduction of nonessential expenditures is a pledge and an earnest of judicious spending in the war effort, it will avail but little. It is true, of course, that the exigencies of war make much and often tremendous waste unavoidable. However indefensible waste should be avoided. We should not dispose of our substance finally and forever as outright gifts on the theory that it is being lend-leased and will be returned to us in some form.

In the committee I offered an amendment to change the title of H. R. 1776 to "A War Aid Act." This was rejected and perhaps properly so. "A rose by any other name smells just as sweet." I shall not offer the same amendment on the floor because the only accomplishment of such a change would be to drive home the modus operandi of the act. On mature deliberation I am convinced that the burdens would outweigh the benefits of such a change. In our experience with nicknames, we find they are not changed easily. However, we should give the public the facts and the realization that the approximately \$60,000,000,000 already appropriated under this act is in reality war aid and not lend-lease.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to another amendment in committee and which was also rejected. I shall abide by those results and not again submit the same amendment. This was an amendment to change the word "deem" to "find" where the former appears in section 3 (b) of the act.

When the lease-lend bill was before the House in February 1941 I made the following statement:

Any attempt to comprehend the war-making power of this bill is baffled at the outset, for no human mind can envision the limitations of the property Congress is hereby asked to appropriate to one man for any use he deems proper. And not only this but Congress appropriates to the President, delegates we generally call it, undefined powers which it has no right to delegate except in a state of war. It is in effect a war bill and I doubt whether any President ever possessed such broad power in time of war.

That, of course, was almost a year before Pearl Harbor, almost a year before we were attacked and had our choice between whether we would fight or surrender and be overrun. It was before we were in the war. The fact that we are in the war has changed the situation to some extent, and yet not altogether so.

Directing myself to section 3 (b) of the Lend-Lease Act it reads:

The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

That word "deems" as a legislative, a judicial, or an administrative term is obsolete. It probably comes down to us from the time before constitutional government and constitutional processes were well established, from the time when a king could still "deem" that a man should be put to death and he was immediately killed without a hearing; but as the constitutional processes became established another word took its place in administrative and judicial processes; that was the word "find." "Find" is a term which in its administrative meaning presupposes the existence of facts upon which the finding can be based; and without the facts the finding cannot stand. In the second place the term "find" presupposes an opportunity for review if there is a reviewing body. As I say, the word "find" has supplemented the word "deem" in legislative and judicial circles. "Deem" is an arbitrary word still in good usage in its literary sense.

The Members may think I am talking somewhat academically, but my convictions on that score were confirmed a few months later when the Foreign Affairs Committee had before it a bill to amend the Visa—or let us call it the Immigration Act. That act had been passed during wartime in the administration of President Wilson. It provided in effect that whenever the United States is at war and the President shall find it necessary to the defense of the United States he may prevent the entry into or the departure from the United States of any person. As I say, that act was passed during wartime. But of course we were not at war in the summer of 1941, although the act was still on the statute books, lying dormant and inoperative. It was claimed before the committee that the administration sought an amendment in order to make it operative at that time, an amendment to provide that whenever the United States is at war or any other two nations shall be at war the President shall have that power. There was no objection to granting that amendment, but it challenged my attention that the word "find" was also changed to the word "deem."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. There was no relationship between the proposed amendment and changing that word "find" to "deem." I asked the Assistant Secretary of State, "Can you tell me why that word 'find' is changed to 'deem'?" He looked surprised and askance, and I think it was sincere, and said: "No; I had not noticed it. I think it is just an inadvertence." So I said, "Is there not

a difference between 'deem' and 'find'?" He said, "No; there is no difference as far as I can see." I said, "Then you certainly will have no objection to my offering an amendment to change the word 'deem' back to 'find'?" He said, "Not the slightest. That is all right with me." I could understand that the term "find" might by inadvertence have been lost or eliminated, but it was difficult to reconcile this with the substitution of "deem."

Then we had a recess for the luncheon hour. In the afternoon we resumed the hearings and the gentleman voluntarily and without any preliminary discussion said: "I want to refer back to the matter brought up by Mr. JONKMAN about changing that word 'deem' back to 'find.'" He said, "We would rather not have that amendment put in because under the word 'deem' the President will have a lot of power which he will not have under the word 'find.'"

My amendment at that time was not accepted in committee and I brought it on the floor. It is in the act today. At that time the defect was cured because it was done immediately.

It is my conviction that by using the term "deems" under section 3 (b) we have done the same thing. Who put that in? I would like to know that. I would like to know who put it in the Immigration Act which we have not been able to find out? I would like to know what forces have been writing the legislation that has been passed by a "rubber stamp" Congress for several years.

Here we have this language, "Whatever the President shall deem satisfactory" in the act. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress cannot waive its constitutional powers and responsibilities with reference to the making of treaties under the Constitution and it is not my claim that the House or the other body has so waived any of its prerogatives. It is my claim, however, that under section 3 (b) the House and the other body have by constitutional processes given their advice and consent in advance to any agreement or any settlement, treaty if you will, that may be made under H. R. 1776, which may involve a hundred billion dollars.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman mean to infer that the provision in the original Lend-Lease Act which gives the President the power to negotiate agreements with the recipient countries would confer upon him the power to put through treaties in connection with that act without ratification of the Senate? Did the Senate consent to those agreements when they approved that act?

Mr. JONKMAN. The Senate in connection with a specific class of agreements gave its advice and consent in advance. They said, "You go ahead, you can accept any payment or repayment, direct or indirect, that you deem satisfactory."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can conceive that the President might negotiate an agreement for repayment or

for the transaction of foreign commerce, using the funds which we had given, as exchange for transportation of goods into the United States and saying that those goods shall come in duty-free.

Mr. JONKMAN. If the gentleman will defer that, I would like to touch upon it just a little later.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true that one of the classes of Executive agreements with other countries that needs no ratification are agreements pursuant to laws passed by the Congress?

Mr. JONKMAN. I think that is correct. I think that the advice and consent has been given in the law. They could not do it as a broad general principle with reference to all treaties but they can do it as to specific treaties and agreements.

Not only do they use the word "deem" but they use the word "satisfactory." You lawyers understand that if you draw a contract in which the person is to deliver goods to your satisfaction, you are the only one that decides whether you want them or not. All the world can say they are satisfactory, but that does not make any difference; if they are not satisfactory to you that is final.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to point out to the gentleman that before he became a Member of Congress I made the point in committee in connection with a small bill that there was a great difference between "deem" and "find." At that time the committee probably thought it was not very important and they agreed to write in the bill the word "find."

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for her contribution, and it goes to prove a well designed, deliberate program to revert back from constitutional terms and processes to those of totalitarianism.

I want to ask, what has been done under article 3? We may look on page 72 of the report and at that famous article 7 of the master agreements. Article 7 of the Russian master agreement—and the other master agreements are similar—provides:

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished under the Act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discrimina-

tory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the basic principles of which were adhered to by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on September 24, 1941.

At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two Governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments.

What does all that verbiage in section 7 of the master agreement mean? I must say that in the committee I was unable to find out that it meant anything. I think that is something the Members of Congress would like to know. I asked, for instance, Is there a general comprehensive plan here to tie in the Lend-Lease Act with a post-war international economy in the same way that President Wilson tried to tie in the League of Nations with the peace treaty?

Mr. Acheson, of the State Department, said "No," and Mr. Berle, of the State Department, said "Yes." Yet between the two of them, in spite of the fact that Mr. Berle's answer seemed promising, I came out of about the same hole with Mr. Berle that I went into.

I would like to read you that testimony. On page 125 of the hearings I asked Mr. Acheson:

Mr. JONKMAN. Is it true that there is an attempt and an intent here to tie in extensive post-war international reforms and relations just as President Wilson tried to tie in the League of Nations with the peace treaty?

Mr. ACHESON. I think not. I think there is a very clear indication here that what we are doing with the other countries is making it as clear as we can to them and getting as firm a commitment from them as possible that they will not attempt to meet the perfectly overwhelming difficulties with which they will be faced by taking a line of policy which would be exclusive. The parties to article VII undertake that they will not pursue trade by various methods which could be regarded as unfair or discriminatory and that they will not use their currencies or their licensing systems or whatever form of control they may have to engage in a form of economic warfare after the war instead of opening up and increasing the trade of the world. It seems to me to say that the greatest benefit the United States can obtain in the economic fields seeing that we do not degenerate into the type of economic warfare which was going on in the late twenties and the thirties. Our object is to have a system which would expand trade rather than cut it down and down and down.

Let us see what Mr. Berle said. On page 226 appears this testimony:

Mr. JONKMAN. Can you give us anything of that broad policy? I asked Mr. Acheson the other day what was meant by that clause or those statements in the master agreements in article VII which reads:

"To that end they shall include provisions for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom open to participation by all other countries of like mind directed to the expansion by appropriate international and domestic bankers of production employment and the ex-

change and consumption of goods which are the material foundation of the liberty and welfare of all people; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

Mr. Acheson was of the opinion that that meant little more than the bare fact—of course, it was premised upon the right to take such payment or repayment as might be deemed satisfactory to the President—referred to little more than that the obligations in our favor would not be repaid in either gold or other commodities. Now, is there not a very broad, extensive plan to fit lend-lease into a post-war international economy, contemplated by the State Department?

Mr. BERLE. I think you can answer that "yes." The State Department has consistently preached and advocated a system of international agreements which shall make possible the steady expanding of international exchange. This involves undoubtedly a series of arrangements looking toward the increase of exchange between countries. The equity of lend-lease, of course, formed one of the arguments for working that out. The end of the war we all of us hope will not be the increased segregation of every nation but will be a return to civilization, which permits and encourages a high degree of transit of commerce, of individuals, of information, and so on.

The aviation question you have under discussion this morning is of course one part, not even a very large part, of that resumption of the normal relations between the civilized countries. Under the master agreement we have entered into a mutual understanding that we will endeavor to cooperate toward that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so the gentleman from Missouri may ask a question of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ELMER. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he can furnish any more information about this lend-lease business than we have received on the floor of the House? Has the gentleman any further information about it than what has been given here in the last 2 days?

Mr. BLOOM. There is nothing I can say in the way of giving information to the committee or to the Members of the House other than what is in the hearings. I believe there is full information there. I do not know of anything new that has come up here.

Mr. ELMER. I have been listening to the discussions here for a couple of days, and have been here every minute of the time, and I am frank to say that I know very little more about it now from the discussions than I did yesterday morning when I first sat down here.

Mr. BLOOM. Why blame me for that?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The next question was:

Mr. JONKMAN. Is it the contemplation of the State Department that upon the cessation of hostilities we will have any balance

in our favor that we can trade for such considerations?

Mr. BERLE. If you are talking financially, I do not think any living being can say.

Further in the testimony I asked this question:

Mr. JONKMAN. But at all events when it comes to the final settlement and we should ask in the nature of a return for some of those obligations a certain—let us call it "franchise in a country"—to land in their airports, under that theory of what may constitute repayment, we haven't anything to bargain with, have we?

Mr. BERLE. I think we have a great deal to bargain with, Mr. Congressman, a very great deal.

Mr. JONKMAN. For instance?

Mr. BERLE. Let us take a single instance—you can carry it out as far as you please in infinite detail. Under this method of carrying on a common war in considerable measure we have pooled production; that is, we have worked out methods by which the British concentrated on certain kinds of production and we on others. At the close of the war therefore we shall be equipped in certain kinds of production, including aviation, to do a great many things for a very long time which they are not equipped to do at all. And, as you probably realize, one of the items which has been worrying our friends in Britain has been that in aviation we are quite likely to move into a situation where we have at once the production and the equipment, and they have relatively little.

When it is said that there are no bargaining points arising out of this, I am frank to say that I do not agree.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is not a bargaining point growing out of the lend-lease arrangement. That is out of our equipment, out of our own economy.

Mr. BERLE. Yes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Isn't that true?

Mr. BERLE. Yes.

Mr. JONKMAN. I was asking for something that grows out of lend-lease?

Mr. BERLE. Yes, but the reason why the economy arranged itself that way is largely due to the lend-lease, you see. We agreed that we would make certain types of planes and lend-lease them to Britain, therefore they did not have to make them, and therefore abandoned it.

Mr. JONKMAN. I quite see your point, but it does not grow out of an obligation arising out of lend-lease as a contract or agreement in which the credit is in our favor.

Mr. BERLE. It grows out of a situation created by the lend-lease operation, to put it accurately, Mr. Congressman. It does not grow out of the signature on the bottom of a note or something of that kind.

So, as I say, I came right out of the same hole I went into without finding out a single thing.

The question is: Do we want to amend the bill so as to change the word "find" for the word "deem"? I think, Mr. Chairman, it is too late. The die was cast in 1941. We gave that power at that time, and not only have agreements been made under it but the final payment has already been decided upon. It is our word and honor that is at stake. We have made those master agreements and we must live up to them, cost what it will.

In the second place, I feel that it will not accomplish anything because, as I have already intimated, we have no trading balance in our favor. We are putting everything we put into lend-lease as a contribution to the preservation of

civilization. It is a contribution of blood and toil and not money, and we might just as well understand it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In other words, the gentleman thinks the books will all be balanced when the war is over, and nothing will be due us?

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely. That is not in writing, that is not in the agreements, but it is plainly understood through the attitude that has been taken and the statements we have made, which are implied in the written and signed agreements.

May I say in conclusion that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] offered an amendment to the committee report in lieu of my amendment stating that it is the sense of the Congress that the constitutional processes have not been abandoned. This is stated in the last paragraph on page 13 of the report. I think that will take care of it as well as anything. But outside of that, I do not think there is anything we can do to retrieve the situation we got into in 1941.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Chairman, we are considering here the question of extending the Lend-Lease Act for 1 year. I am for it. I think every man in the armed forces is for it. I think 90 percent of the American people are for it.

I came direct to this Congress from the Army. In the Army I personally felt very appreciative of lend-lease. It held, so to speak, the left and right flank. It was the mechanism by which arms were supplied to the men who were to fight beside our men. In this war for the control of a planet, lend-lease has helped Russia hold and then counterattack at Stalingrad, helped China hold and then counterattack at Ichang, helped England hold and then counterattack in Egypt. By keeping the enemy busy at other points, it helped make possible our taking of Guadalcanal and of north Africa.

Now, in this debate, we have gotten off as to how much money it is going to cost. We have wandered off as to who controls it—as to whether or not Harry Hopkins or some other Washington figure has anything to do with it.

Those are minor points.

In all this debate, let us never lose sight of the fact that lend-lease is a military necessity; that if we do not have lend-lease, we will simply have to take the same action under another name. Let us debate these minor points, fully and thoroughly, but let us never lose

sight of the underlying fact—military necessity.

I hope this bill will pass without amendment. Since I have been here, this is the only Government agency that I have heard unanimously complimented. Everyone agrees that lend-lease is well run. It would appear that there is no vital need for amendment on the administrative side.

Now, this act was passed in 1941, and since that time we have had a parade of circumstance such as the human mind can scarcely conceive. For reasons best known to himself and his intuition, Hitler jumped on Russia. And for reasons which my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] so lucidly explained on the floor of this House, Japan finally exploded in the Pacific. One day we were peacefully shipping scrap iron to Japan, the next we got it back at Pearl Harbor.

And through it all, lend-lease operated, operated with sufficient flexibility to meet all these changing conditions. In the face of its success, rash indeed is the man who steps forward to amend it. It has operated so successfully in such turbulent times that we should leave it alone.

Remember that this bill created bitter debate when it was first passed. Let us not now go back into that old, vinegarish, acidic, bitter background. Let us not introduce amendments which will have to be debated in the old hate-worn phrases of 2 years ago. When we speak here, we are not only speaking to the United States, we are speaking to the world. Let us present to the world a face of national unity—of national unity on this bill which is one of the keystones of our foreign policy.

Let us not distort this act with amendments. Remember that nations like China are fighting with the sole hope that we can find a way to get lend-lease aid to them in time. To distort, to amend, to change this bill at this time, would cause doubt and dismay on the battle fronts of our allies.

Yesterday my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] said that lend-lease was "not a two-way street, but a one-way avenue." The gentleman from New York is always worried about smears. He worries a great deal about them, and he worries about them in almost every newspaper.

I feel that if I were a Russian and looked at Stalingrad and its ruins, or a Chinese and looked at the ruins of Chungking, or an Englishman and looked at the ruins of London, and I was told that my help in reciprocal lend-lease was so unimportant as not to be considered, I regard that as very close to being a smear. We do get reciprocal lend-lease from allies, and we even get it from China. It is small, but China is a poor country. She does not have very much to give, and I suppose in comparison with what we are sending China, reciprocal lend-lease of China is small indeed. But I feel it is not being fair to our allies to say that this is a one-way avenue. The Chinese are doing the best they can.

They are helping us out the best they can, and I feel that, while not a smear, it is very close to it.

I commend to the gentleman from New York the spirit expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] who yesterday in his address said something rather similar to this: "That we are all in one team together, we are going to win together, or we are going to lose together, and I wish that instead of criticizing our allies we would cooperate with them."

To repeat, Mr. Chairman, I wish that this bill could go through without amendment, and I wish that tomorrow we will remember that we are speaking not only to the United States, but also to the world. There are nations that have been fighting and holding on for 2 years with this particular bill as one of their great hopes. To amend this bill and distort it would be most unfortunate, and I hope that the bill will be passed without amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of California. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is talking about being a team. That is true, but on any football team, if some one falls, or the coach or the captain thinks that one member is not doing a complete job, it does not do any harm to mention the fact? The gentleman, I know, agrees with this.

Mr. ROGERS of California. I feel this is not the time for one of our allies to question another.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of California. Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY. I should just like to ask one question in answer to the question just heard. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] the coach on the team?

Mr. ROGERS of California. I do not feel that I should answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, on March 12, 1941, or it will be 2 years this coming Friday, President Roosevelt called to the White House to discuss what amount of money should be considered in the first lend-lease appropriation bill the following Members of Congress: Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia; Congressman JOHN TABER, of New York; Congressman ANDREW JACKSON MAY, of Kentucky; Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia; Senator JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina; Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee; Congressman J. BUELL SNYDER, of Pennsylvania; Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri; Congressman CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, of Virginia; and Mr. M. C. Sheild, clerk of the Appropriations Committee.

Contrary to what was said in many of the papers at that time, the President did not tell us he wanted \$7,000,000,000 for lend-lease. As in any democratic conference, he asked us how much we

thought it should be. He said suggestions had come in to him, ranging any place from \$1,000,000,000 to \$11,000,000,000. So, before leaving the White House that day it was rather unanimous that the amount should be \$7,000,000,000. That amount was reported from the deficiency appropriations committee and approved by Congress.

At that time lend-lease was not so popular among all Members of Congress as it is today because the vote shows that on the first lend-lease appropriation bill the House vote was, on March 19, 1941, yeas 336 to nays 55.

On the second lend-lease appropriation bill on October 10, 1941, the vote was yeas 328 to nays 67.

On the third lend-lease appropriation bill, on December 5, 1941, the vote was yeas 310 to nays 5.

I was one of those who was strong for the lend-lease from its very inception. We know now that had it not been for the lend-lease the world war situation would be quite different today. The lend-lease is the very backbone of unity among the allies.

If it had not been for lend-lease there would have been no American victory at the Solomon Islands last August 7. If there had been no victory at Solomon Islands, Stalingrad would never have stood up against the German onslaught. You ask why? Well, the Solomon Islands victory made it sure in the eyes of Russia that Japan would not attack Russia at that time or this last winter. That being true, Russia was able to bring something like a quarter million of her northern army with tanks and planes and munitions and guns down to help out the other armies around Stalingrad. There would have been no big-scale bombing on the European front had it not been for lend-lease. Of course, many of us think that the all-out Allied, English, and American front that started with a thousand planes and has been kept up almost constantly ever since is a second front, so called, of great magnitude, inasmuch as the best information we can get is that we have destroyed anywhere from 20 to 35 percent of the German and Italian war production facilities and establishments. Also there would have been no invasion of north Africa had it not been for lend-lease. This north African front is another front of considerable magnitude at this hour and one that Russia should recognize as a real front the same as the bombing front in Europe and the Solomon Islands front in the South Pacific. Yes; our lend-lease procedure as we see it now has not only aided the Allies in such a big way as they can continue to fight in a much stronger way, but on the other hand we believe in the end it will be the means of saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys.

I wish to take this occasion to congratulate the Foreign Affairs Committee on bringing out not only this bill with such splendid information summarized in the hearings. You have done a good job, and I believe that the House will show its confidence in your work and in

lend-lease procedure by a unanimous vote in the adoption of this resolution.

Of course, a big job like taking care of the lend-lease must have a big man at the head of it. President Roosevelt showed fine judgment when he selected Hon. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., to handle this gigantic problem. His business skills and business experience fitted him for the position, and he has proven, in handling the same, that we have at the head of this great undertaking a man for whom we all have the utmost respect and every confidence.

In this same field, I might say that to handle our end of the lend-lease in England is no small job. It was my privilege right before Pearl Harbor to go to England in the same clipper with Hon. Averill Harriman, who has charge of lend-lease in Europe. I had an opportunity to discuss lend-lease with him in detail, and in London I saw the way he conducted his office affairs and his office procedure. And again I say we are fortunate to have a businessman of the ability of Mr. Harriman looking after our lend-lease interests in that part of the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, we as a Nation are engaged in the greatest war in the history of mankind. What we do and say here today should be that which raises the hope and sustains the morale of our people. It is true that we cannot all agree upon one program, or upon one phase of a program, but it is agreed in the hearts and minds of all of us that our one great objective is the winning of this war. Each of us has our own ideas about the methods we should use to attain that mighty objective—our national defense and our war effort. To this end, I have voted for every lend-lease appropriation measure in the past 2 years since it was enacted into law.

The measure upon which we now debate is a program of providing goods and services to nations resisting the Axis aggressors, undertaken for the defense of this country and carried out in the interests of the people of the United States. We have aided other peoples under lend-lease because their interests coincided with our interests.

Unless one has carefully studied the reports presented by the Administrator, and listened with interest to all the testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee by those in charge of the administration of the program, they are unaware of the important part being played by this aid in the global war of today.

The goods and services which we speed to our allies are but one of the many streams flowing into the pool of the United Nations' resources. And it is well to remember that we are not fighting this war alone. We are fighting side by side with every country that sees in the Axis the grave threat to human liberties which, together, we must wipe out. The pooling of resources, therefore, is as much to our benefit as to that of any other nation in the world.

Under the program we receive what is technically termed reciprocal lend-lease or lend-lease in reverse. Such aid, provided without dollar payment by the United States, has already meant millions of dollars in savings to us. Without it, we would have been obliged to furnish our forces in the various parts of the world with immense quantities of food and of varied matériel that has instead been furnished by our allies. We would have been forced to send thousands of civilian employees to the various fronts to engage in the many endeavors coincidental to the maintenance of our armed forces on their far-flung battle lines. We have received this, however, in goods and services under lend-lease in reverse.

Major Spiegelberg, of the General Purchasing Board, testified before the committee that, in the period from June 1 to December 31, 1942, more than 1,121,000 ships' tons of articles and equipment have been received by us through this reverse process. And this does not include the materials for construction which the British have supplied solely for our forces and which the major avers, will mean an expenditure to the British of \$560,000,000 when completed.

In addition to this material aid, we receive immense benefit in the exchange of scientific and technical information so vital to the mechanized warfare of today. The fact that Great Britain has had prior war experience has greatly benefited America in the days that have followed the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor by the treacherous Nipponese, for all that the British have learned in actual combat has been turned over to us, whether from the standpoint of education in aircraft or weapons of war. We knew, therefore, of many things in record time, things that we would otherwise not have learned until our baptism by fire; things that would have cost us quantities of matériel in loss, and perhaps thousands of lives. This, of itself, is of far greater value to our united war effort than can ever be measured in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. Chairman, I have been pleased with the able administration of our lend-lease program, and the reverse system by which we are benefited. But I view with consternation, too, the fact that the one country which may, in the course of present history, prove to be our greatest ally, has received far too little aid under this program. I specifically refer to China, the country whose first lady, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, recently gave this Congress one of the finest addresses any of us have ever heard. I do not mean to reflect in any way on Great Britain, or any other recipient of lend-lease aid, by pointing out that China has received next to nothing under this act. But I am convinced that China should have more help, in an ever-increasing measure, of the raw materials, the oil, the guns, ammunition, the tanks, and planes she needs so badly. We dare not for one moment underestimate the cunning and the power of our Japanese adversary in the Pacific; consequently, we dare not

fail to adequately supply China with vital and strategic materials, for the Chinese manpower is our greatest present weapon in the Pacific theater of war. However hungry and pitiful the loyal followers of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek may be; however poorly clothed and fed; regardless of the suffering they have endured for 5 years; the Chinaman who dreams of freedom, of liberty, is a first-class fighting man, and we can thank God that we have him on our side. And, as material evidence of our faith in China, we should make every effort, every sacrifice, to ship abundant supplies to this ally so that they may hold back the treacherous Jap and delay the hordes of Hirohito until the not-too-distant day when MacArthur leads his legions into Tokyo as our planes bomb the last vestiges of Japanese arrogance from their own island home, and our Navy steams into the harbors of the "Dying Sun."

Then, too, Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised at the attitude of our Russian ally. I am sure that not one of us here in the House missed the speech of Josef Stalin, made little more than a week ago on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the U. S. S. R. The speech in which Stalin, addressing his people, stated that Russia was bearing alone the weight of the war with Germany. Perhaps the head of the Soviet Union did not mean to imply that the Soviets were lacking in proper support of their allies, but that is the implication which almost everyone took from his address.

We realize how devastating to the Germans has the Russian drive been; there is no comparison in modern warfare of the brave and courageous march the Russians have begun and sustained, annihilating German manpower to such a degree that Hitler and his satellites are quaking in their boots.

But let us not forget that effective lend-lease to the Russians has been of tremendous influence to them and without it, it is extremely doubtful if they could not only have sustained their present drive, but have withheld the German sieges that caused the Russian retreat of a year ago. We began to ship lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union in the fall of 1941, and to date, according to the Stettinius report, we have supplied them with more than one and one-half billion dollars' worth of goods and services. Up to the beginning of last December we have given them 2,600 planes, 3,200 tanks, 81,000 trucks and jeeps, and every one of us here in this House knows the incomparable advantages in modern warfare of this great mechanized equipment. Let me remind the Members that this equipment represented more than we shipped to any other country, including Great Britain, under our lend-lease program. Great Britain in the same period of time gave the Russians another 2,000 planes and 2,600 tanks. No; my friends, Russia is not fighting the Axis alone. I am quite emphatic in my statements when I say again that without this magnificent aid from the United States, and that from Great Britain which cannot be discounted, all the courage and fearlessness of the Soviets would have availed

them nothing. You cannot fight dive bombers unless you have dive bombers and fighter planes of your own. You cannot send infantry against panzer divisions; you have to have tanks to fight the same kind of fight.

And still another factor should be made more apparent. Russia needs food; as the famed Napoleon is credited with saying, "An army travels on its stomach," and the Russians, with their own wheat fields devastated, and their stores of food hard hit, could not have fought and marched and driven without food supplies adequate to take care of her millions of soldiers and civilians vital to her war effort. The United States has therefore been shipping large consignments of food to the embattled Soviets and, as has been stated by Lend-Lease Administration officials during the hearings on H. R. 1501, food supplies going to Russia from now on are expected to exceed by a considerable margin lend-lease food shipments to all other parts of the world combined, including those shipped to the United Kingdom. Food, Mr. Speaker, is ammunition, and it is the kind of ammunition that has helped to keep the Russian Army in the fight, without which the present Russian story might have been entirely different, and might have proven to be disastrous for all the United Nations.

There is one other point I wish to develop with regard to the extension of lend-lease. During the course of the hearings I questioned Administrator Stettinius with regard to the return of materials which are lend-leased to other countries. I was thinking particularly of manufactured materials which are being shipped to all United Nations qualified to receive them under the broad provisions of H. R. 1776, the original Lend-Lease Act, and which can be returned to us at the end of the war in like kind. The assumption is that, if we give England 20 tractors, she can return 20 tractors to us at the cessation of hostilities. While this may seem, at the outset, to be reasonable, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that such a return of tractors or any other finished materials at the end of the war will mean that much more unemployment of American labor at that time. The workmen of Britain, or any other country so constrained to return such products, will have the work and we will receive the finished product while our own factories may be idle. The provisions of the act allow us to accept strategic raw materials in return for such lend-lease, and I sincerely believe it would be most wise for those in charge of the administration of this act to so arrange that, when the time comes and victory has been won, we bring back the strategic raw materials that will give work to our American people, be it in exchange for tractors, farm machinery, industrial machinery or machine tools of any kind as well as the instruments of war.

It was most gratifying to me to have Administrator Stettinius state that he and his coworkers, as well as State Department officials, have had this point in mind. However, I believe we should

have some definite assurance that such equipment will not, of itself, be returned to us save in the form of strategic raw materials.

In my humble opinion, all things considered, lend-lease is a tangible policy of direct effect upon our war effort and it should be extended at this time. I am deeply concerned with the fact that we need a constructive foreign policy that combines economy and efficiency with the original object of winning the war and in using our ultimate victory wisely. I believe lend-lease is a part of such a policy and ask my colleagues to support H. R. 1501, extending the provisions of the act for an additional year so that the great bulk of production not used by our own forces continues to go to those 43 nations who are our allies, and who will make the most effective use of it to bring to an early and glorious end this great global war, and so that we in the United States can protect, preserve, and perpetuate our Republic and the American way of life.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset let me say that I am heartily in favor of extending the Lend-Lease Act and of the action taken by the Foreign Affairs Committee in unanimously reporting the bill now before the House. I will try in the very few minutes allotted to me not to repeat or cover the ground so well covered in the last 2 days, but to raise two questions that are not perhaps serious at this moment, when there is practically unanimity in the House in respect to the lend-lease program, but which may in the next 12 months cause very serious concern to all of us. The bill as originally enacted gave to the President colossal powers and colossal responsibilities. Section 3(b) has been read here and under that section of the act the President alone can determine to what nations and in what amounts materials of war are to be sent, and the President alone is empowered to determine the benefits which the United States shall receive in return.

The congressional grant of authority is made in the broadest terms with no guide to the President's judgment and no limitation on his discretion. There is no definition of benefits. Congress did not incorporate in the statute any criteria to govern the policy to be pursued.

The bill now before the House providing for a 12-month extension of the act is similarly devoid of any specific directions or precise expression of congressional intent. No provision has been made for registering congressional judgment and concurrence with respect to what is done in fulfillment of the program. It is a situation that contains the seeds of future difficulties and controversies, political and economic, as well as military.

A great deal has been said as to whether or not an international debt is being created by the act and by the renewal of the act. The very term lend-lease implies something to be repaid.

Section 3 (a) specifically states that payment or repayment in kind or property "or such other direct or indirect benefits" shall be such as the President deems satisfactory.

Finally, the master lend-lease agreements employ the phrase "final determination of benefits." This language in conjunction with the other words very clearly implies some form of debt which must be liquidated by a final agreement.

I feel that that may lead to very serious misunderstandings in the future. It is with respect to the question of the benefits which accrue to the United States and the danger of public misconception on this score that I testified at the committee hearings on the pending bill on February 16. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] today said it would be infinitely better if we were not trying to set up balance sheets, and I agree with him. To try to evaluate our contributions to our allies and their contributions to us, and to try to strike a balance on a dollar-and-cents basis, misrepresents the true nature of these transactions, and to cultivate an expectation of some post-war settlement in gold or goods is to invite future trouble.

Let me rapidly run over the possible benefits that may accrue. Reverse lend-lease—the amount of supplies and services which our allies are currently giving to us—is very largely of inestimable assistance in our common undertaking. I think we are all in agreement now that in the post-war period receiving benefits in the form of money or in goods or in services will be impossible. They will not be there to be given or taken. We must look elsewhere if there are to be benefits. You can find a second category of benefits under the head of strategic bases, as has been discussed, or under the head of air fields and air rights throughout the world. It is my own feeling that the lend-lease agreements are very doubtful instruments to use to try to secure those advantages. Let me explain that.

To try to withhold lend-lease materials from any nation in the world today that requires it to fight this common war seems to me to be unconscionable. Yet many people believe that lend-lease should be used as a leverage with which to secure advantages for ourselves in the form of material things.

Finally, the forms of benefits which are contemplated in the master lend-lease agreements are of two kinds—benefits that come as trade agreements and benefits that might come as post-war political agreements.

To my mind, the entire lend-lease operation, as has been stated before, is essentially a military operation. It is a vehicle by which we contribute to the waging of a war which has become a joint undertaking of ourselves and our allies.

It was and is today as much in our national interest to furnish materials of war including foodstuffs to those nations which are fighting our enemies as it was and is of assistance to them. It

is undertaken with a view to bringing about completion by joint effort, and by "completion," I think we can all agree, we mean complete victory and security for the nations after that victory. That security can of course be obtained or we hope it can be obtained in a number of ways. Presumably there must be political agreements. Presumably there must be some economic agreements. Presumably also it is those agreements as contemplated in the master lend-lease that will represent benefits to the United States. But I still fear serious misunderstandings on this score, and I fear them particularly 12 months from now when this matter will again come before the House for further renewal, unless the war has ended, because at that time, whether we like it or not, this country will be approaching a Presidential election at which time political and partisan advantage may well be taken of what may be considered inadequacy of the benefits accruing to the United States under the lend-lease program.

The second thing I fear and fear greatly under this act, may likewise face us 12 months from now. We have heard a great deal about the food situation in the United States. Anyone looking dispassionately at our statistical position as far as food is concerned cannot help but be struck by the very ugly fact that 12 months from now we are likely to be suffering from a serious shortage of food in this country, a shortage which will be accentuated by the fact that as a weapon of war we must use food to send to foreign nations.

I had considerable experience with regard to food and the distribution of food as a weapon of war and a weapon of peace immediately after the last war. We are going to have to pull our belts in. We are going to have to pull them in very seriously within the next 12 months. When that time comes it is going to be inevitable that many people in this country will be saying, and saying loudly, that this country should be fed first before we send any food abroad for foreign nations. Frankly, I feel that somehow we must manage to do both. We must manage to feed our own people, but we must not suspend the immensely necessary shipments of food to our allies and to subject peoples that may be released from the German yoke, and I am afraid, however, that with a growing shortage of food the clamor for halting food shipments under lend-lease may grow and may turn very seriously to embarrass all of us at a time when the renewal of lend-lease comes before us once again. I can well visualize a situation in the next 12 months where our troops will be entering Greece, southern Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, or Denmark. Wherever we go we will find starving peoples. As a purely military matter, entirely aside from a humanitarian matter, it is going to be absolutely essential for us to feed the people. If we do not do it, who will feed them?

If I know anything of the temper of the American doughboy, he is not going

to wage war in a country where women and children are starving unless he shares his own last crust with those women and children. As a purely military matter, any commander in the field will tell you the most dangerous thing to cope with is a starving civilian population at your back when you are undertaking a military operation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman speaks from experience, because he did a very fine work during the World War in Europe along the line of feeding hungry people.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the lady for her compliment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HERTER. I think there is need of pointing out the dangers that we are facing in the next 12 months, but I should like to make what I believe to be a constructive contribution to the discussion. I should like to see the leadership of both sides of this House, by appropriate resolution, not only commission but instruct the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or perhaps a subcommittee of it or a special subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, to maintain a continuing review of the entire lend-lease operations, with all its ramifications of foreign policy.

Lend-lease sends us reports once every 3 months. The reports are sent to Congress as a whole; what is everybody's business is nobody's business. I feel that the example of what the committee has done in giving information to the House in the last few days, and through the House to the people of the country through its reports, ought to be a continuous operation. This is not a partisan matter. It is a matter of such import to the success of the war effort that it should be continued. Many serious misunderstandings could be avoided in this way. A continuing examination by a special committee and an impartial appraisal of what is being done under the lend-lease program might well go a long way toward reassuring the country at a time when such reassurance may be badly needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time for the purpose of clearing up the record on one matter that happens to fall to my lot.

The United States Navy some days ago unofficially expressed the desire through its Secretary and high-ranking officers that the United States acquire for naval purposes throughout the Pacific a certain series of bases, where we now have installations, and where possibly some installations will be made further in this war or even during peacetime. The

House Naval Affairs Committee was instructed to appoint a subcommittee to handle that matter. I was made the chairman of that subcommittee. The Navy Department, our subcommittee, and the Department of State are working on the matter.

There has been so much talk about lend-lease and there has been an attempt on the part of many commentators and some newspaper writers to link up this desire on the part of the Navy with some sort of reverse lend-lease assistance in relation to Australia, New Zealand, China, and even Russia. I want to make the record clear on this point by saying that the only purpose, the only desire of going about doing the spade work of acquiring these needed bases throughout the Pacific, is motivated by purely military purposes. It has nothing to do with lend-lease, and I like to think of it in this way: That is merely a desire on the part of the Navy to get the implements, those implements that are going to be necessary for the Navy in this war and the post-war world in the Pacific to carry out the inescapable responsibility that is going to devolve upon the United States Navy in the Pacific Ocean.

I cannot see any reason, and I do not know of any fact that has been presented, when this war is over that it will not be the bulk of our responsibility to maintain peace in the Pacific. Surely it is our main responsibility to fight the war in the Pacific; and ours alone, in the north, of course, aided by Australia and New Zealand; and what we are giving to Australia and New Zealand under lend-lease has nothing to do with this move at all; and I hope the record will stand clear once and for all that the United States Navy, or my committee, or any other group that has anything to do with this is not in any way connecting up what we do with lend-lease to Australia, New Zealand or these other countries.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad the gentleman made that statement. I take it that, in other words, the Naval Affairs Committee has just done its duty in making studies now so it can make proper recommendations to the Congress concerning bases that are needed for the protection of this country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, in other words, it means we want to have at our disposal during the war and after the war such implements, whether they be bases by lease or acquisition or taken from the enemy by force—such implements that we can better carry out the responsibility that is going to be ours in the Pacific.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to compliment the committee for having undertaken this work and compliment it also on its selection of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What we are doing by lend-lease for Australia and New Zealand may, as the gentleman from New York pointed out, when the books are balanced be just about even.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe there is a feeling now that we should have acquired things that way long ago. I wish the gentleman would read, although probably he has already done so, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Berle. Mr. Berle indicates that our privileges and rights should be preserved. He did not recommend an amendment to the Lend-Lease Act, but I feel that in his statement there is very clear indication of what his wishes are for the future, that we should have ample protection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have heard talk about the possible ingratitude of other countries. I think the House should know that 10 days ago, after the formation of this group, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, through his Minister in Washington, Mr. Nash, demonstrated the reaction of his country to this program by saying publicly to the whole world that they in New Zealand were an ally of the United States and were perfectly willing to sit down then and discuss leasing the bases we may need for use in the Pacific.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. After all, it is our responsibility to look after our own protection; we cannot expect other nations to do it for us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then there are the Japanese mandated islands. I hope that within a short time we shall have hundreds of them. We should be laying the ground work and doing the spade work, so that when we go to the peace table we shall know how we want to do this job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington in order that he may answer a question of the delegate from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I hope the gentleman and his able subcommittee will give some thought not only to the acquisition of bases in the Pacific but to the reacquisition of one of the finest harbors and one of the most splendid natural bases in the Pacific; that is in the island of Kiska, now in the possession of the enemy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Navy has that under active consideration at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, for 2 days now I have listened to speeches by Members of this House on this lend-lease bill. It stirs me that in these 2 days of debate it appears that the Members of this House have completely lost their heads. Time and again I have heard statements by the vast majority in this House to the effect that this act is misnamed. Statements have been made to the effect time and again that this is not a lend-lease bill that it is a "give-away" bill. I cannot conceive Members of this House losing their heads so completely that all they are thinking of is giving away and getting nothing in return.

I have never heard, in the entire history of the world, of any country that ever got any place just giving away and getting nothing in return. I ask you in all decency and in all fairness, how far do you think this country will get by giving away its manpower, by giving away its blood, by giving its money and by giving away its natural resources without getting one iota in return.

It appears that the Members of this House are more worried of the welfare of the people outside of the United States than they are concerned about our own people within the United States. We talk of starvation and deprivation everywhere else in the world, but we close our eyes to the starvation and the deprivation right here at home. For right here at home today, right now, we have hundreds of thousands of people who are just as bad off as some of the people in other parts of the world that we are so concerned about. I am talking about our old people who today, with the high cost of living, do not even get enough to keep body and soul together. All they are getting from us is slow starvation allowances. And it worries me terribly to see the attitude of this House in the frame of mind where they literally want to give this country away to somebody else and at the same time close their eyes to the deprivation and starvation here at home.

Mr. Chairman, do not misunderstand me. I am for the cooperation of the United Nations in prosecuting this war. I feel that we should do our share. Yes; I even feel that we should do more than our share. But I do not agree with the Members of this House that we should do everything and pay for everything. I feel that every country in the United Nations cause should do its just share. And I am of the honest opinion that there are nations in the United Nations cause who are not exerting themselves to the limit simply because they know that we are an easy mark and will do it ourselves if they do not.

The British Empire consists of more than one-fourth of all the land in the world. The sun never sets on the British Empire. The British Empire has more than 500,000,000 people, or more than one-fourth of all the people in the world. The British Empire has more natural wealth and far more resources as a whole than any country in the rest of the world.

Yet the total exertion on the part of this vast empire for the coming year will be somewhere around \$30,000,000,000,

and it has so far organized an army totaling not more than 7,000,000 men.

The United States of America is a small country compared to the British Empire. We have one-fourth the population of the British Empire; we do not have one-half the resources of the British Empire; and yet our exertion this year will reach a total of more than \$110,000,000,000, and our goal is to have an Army of 11,000,000 men. Now, understand me, I am not saying that we are doing too much. I feel that this is an all-out war, and we must exert ourselves all the way. However, I think that this should be uniformly so. And it is high time that other countries in the United Nations cause exerted themselves all of the way.

I think that in consideration of this give-away bill we should consider some danger signs. We should not let our judgment run away from us. We must consider the consequences as well as the good points. I propose to consider some of these consequences today and to put a sign post here and there marking the danger that lies ahead if we are going to completely lose our heads about this proposition. I am concerned especially about the matter of our financial structure and how much it can stand before it breaks completely from under us.

I am seriously concerned about the frightening way in which our debt has been accumulating. And I am especially so seriously concerned when I consider what a beautiful and magnificent job the British are doing in holding their national debt down. And while we are so seriously concerned about the startling increase in our national debt, there are still right in this House Members who are already planning to rehabilitate the world at our expense and further increase our national debt. And then at the same time, these Members are so faint-hearted that they say, "We don't want anything out of this war; we just want the honor of giving this country away man by man and piece by piece."

What am I talking about? Simply this. The United States of America and Great Britain are the only 2 nations in the history of the world that have not yet gone through the financial wringer. Before this Second World War started, this country and Britain already had a heavy national debt. Right now, for instance, we still owe every penny that we spent in the last World War, and that was 26 years ago. On top of that we have the debt of the large-scale relief program. And now on top of that we are going to have another \$200,000,000,000 added to our National debt as a result of this war. At the beginning of this war the British financial position, however, was worse than ours. Suffice it to say that only a year ago the British pound sterling was sold for as little as \$1.50. That is how bad the British finances were in 1939. A British pound worth only \$1.50 compared to the official value of \$4 per pound.

However, what has happened as a result of our running wild in spending money. In the 14 months that we have been at war we have almost ruined our

financial structure while Britain, during 3 years of war, has actually improved its financial structure.

Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to read for you an article from the New York Herald Tribune, written by Geoffrey Parson, London correspondent. I want to read this article to you to show you what is happening to the financial structure of the United States of America as a result of our careless finances and as a result of our losing our heads completely. Here is the article which Geoffrey Parson, the London correspondent, sends to the New York Herald Tribune, and just listen to this article:

There has been considerable discussion of a discreet sort in British financial circles in the last few weeks about the current relative value of the pound sterling and the American dollar, with some fairly strong suggestions that the dollar is due for a revaluation in terms of pound sterling.

Various calculations have been brought forward to show that the American dollar is not exactly up to the position it currently holds in relation to the English pound. United States Budget estimates for 1943-44 total around \$100,000,000,000, compared with approximately \$20,000,000,000 for Great Britain. On the basis of these calculations Britain, with less than one-third the population of the United States, is spending only one-fifth as much money for the prosecution of the war.

"It is known," points out the financial editor of the News Chronicle, "for example, that the costs of certain manufactured war products in America is in dollars much higher than four times their cost in pounds here. It is known that the ratio of wages of workers doing comparable work is nearer \$8 to the pound than \$4.

"And again, the pay of American soldiers is notoriously much higher than the pay of British soldiers. At \$4 to the pound the American private soldier gets something over 8 shillings a day, against the British Tommy's 3 shillings, i. e., between 2½ and 3 times as much, giving an equivalent of, say, \$10 to \$11 to the pound.

"In view of all this evidence," says this financial expert, "we must conclude that America's war expenditure—the American war effort—is to a not inappreciable extent overstated by translating dollars into pounds at four to one. The last thing I want to do would be to minimize America's effort. That is, by any mode of calculating, colossal. Nevertheless, there are dangers in exaggerating, and I can only express my belief that it would be a more accurate measure to take the dollar at about 6 to the pound and to say that America's 1943-44 war expenditures will not be 5 times ours, but 3 times ours."

Other comparisons have been put forward to illustrate what is called an inaccurate relationship between the dollar and the pound. The average hourly wage in America, it was pointed out, is almost double that in Britain, which assuming an equal productivity, would presume an exchange value of \$8 to \$9 to the pound. On comparable war work, it is suggested, such as ship construction, American production is much more costly, even though faster.

As one observer remarked, if the production of ships or munitions takes more man-hours in the United States and each man-hour carries double the wage rate there, it follows that, for comparing the output of these, more than \$8, perhaps in some cases as much as \$16, must be reckoned to the pound.

There you have it, ladies and gentlemen, and remember this is not a Nazi viewpoint, this is the viewpoint of our

friends. This is the viewpoint of one of our leading allies. They see in our wild finances more danger than the Members of our own House assembled right here see. British financiers are actually more worried about our financial structure than we are here representing the people of the United States of America. Here we actually have a condition of affairs where people who know finances are beginning to tell us that the British pound sterling and the American dollar must be revaluated. Here we have members of high finance telling us that the British pound sterling is not worth \$4 a pound but it is actually worth \$16 a pound because of America's loose finances and loose spending.

Herein, ladies and gentlemen, lies a very evident danger signal. In considering this "give-away bill" then let us stop for at least 5 minutes and consider the consequences and see if we are not going too far. Let us actually stop, look, and listen before it is too late and I ask you in all fairness, with the danger staring us in the face, "Is it not rather silly to talk now about a world order and about rehabilitating the world?" How in the world can we rehabilitate the world if the credit of the United States of America is being crushed out? How can we rehabilitate the world if as a result of our loose finances we find that our dollar is worth nothing on the world market, and it seems rather ironical to me that at this time when we are losing our heads about saving the world, those we are about to save are already beginning to question the credit and the financial structure of the country that is about to save them. I plead with you and I beg with you, Members of the House, to keep our feet on the ground. No matter how far we may lose our heads, no matter how far we might let our emotions run away with us, for the sake of our country let us keep our feet firmly on the ground. Unless we do that, we are not saving humanity, we are merely putting this country in so weak a position that instead of us trying to save the world, we might have to call upon the world to save us.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it would appear that I am to be the only Member of the House who is taking the floor in this debate and opposing this bill.

I am happy for the distinction.

If this bill were not passed the President would still have \$55,000,000,000 of so-called lend-lease money to spend.

I shall vote against extending the time of the so-called Lend-Lease Act, and I want the Members of the House, but more especially the people who elected me to Congress, to know my reasons for taking this action.

I voted against the lend-lease bill when it was originally proposed because I believed it to be against the best interests of our country. Since then I have become more and more convinced of the correctness of that position, and I am

now more than ever opposed to this program and policy.

It is my studied conviction that this scheme is actually injuring our war effort, instead of aiding it; that it has in it potentialities to lose the peace for us, and the possibilities of completely undermining our economy and involving our country in some sort of international or world economic and social order that would destroy us as an independent Nation.

It is not generally known that this program is being used not only as a war measure, but also as a means to bring about a politically planned world state. It forms a part of the grandiose scheme of the bureaucrats and politicians, directed by the President, to plan for our country a different kind of economy and government than we have heretofore been living under. Lend-lease is being used as a mixture for aiding the war effort, and for global economic and social planning. This fact should constantly be kept clearly in mind for a true understanding of the subject we are considering, for it cannot help but affect seriously our war activity, as well as our future way of life.

Another thing should also be kept in mind, namely, the term "lend-lease" is a complete misnomer, and, so far as I can find out, nothing even remotely comparable with this scheme can be found anywhere in the history of mankind.

Thirteen witnesses, in all, appeared before the committee to testify. Eight of them were administration representatives and five were Congressmen.

No attempt whatever was made to develop the far-reaching and profound implications involved in the giving away of so great a portion of our substance through lease-lend, or to determine the effect upon our economy, or upon our war effort, or upon our very sovereignty. Only the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman MAAS, touched upon the effect upon our war effort. In my opinion, he made out a good case against giving our war supplies away to other nations, as we are doing, when these supplies are so badly needed by our own soldiers in the Pacific area, where, he stated, there is a critical shortage of supplies. The gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman MAAS, however, supported the bill.

Perhaps the most outstanding feature in the hearings on this bill is the new streamlined cliché or slogan invented by the administration spokesmen for lend-lease to further delude the public. No doubt it has been sensed that there is a deep-seated propensity in the minds of the people against giving our substance away under the mask of lend-lease, especially our war supplies, when our own soldiers in the field are in such dire need of fighting equipment. Probably the smoldering resentment that is welling up against this anomalous program is also being sensed. Otherwise, why the strained effort by the administration witnesses to make it appear that we are now receiving supplies from the countries to which we extend lend-lease, in such substantial amounts as to make the

transaction practically an even trade? A new subterfuge had to be found. "Lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse" will do the trick, so it appears the administration witnesses thought. With this sophisticated catch-all phrase it is now hoped to lull the opposition.

It is remarkable how the administration witnesses before the Foreign Affairs Committee leaned backward to make out a case for what they called "lend-lease in reverse" or "reciprocal aid," or the amount of supplies furnished us by the countries receiving lend-lease. In reading the testimony of these witnesses one is almost forced to conclude they had been drilled in what to say and to stress this point.

THE TERM LEND-LEASE IS A DECEPTION

When one lends or leases anything of value, one gives it over to another temporarily, either without or with compensation for its use, on condition that the thing itself, its equivalent in kind, or something of equal value be returned to the person who did the lending or leasing. There is a contract between the parties which specifically provides for final settlement. Nothing like this is involved in the concept of lend-lease.

In a few words, lend-lease simply means that we give away to other nations, not only our allies, but others as well, things of value, presumably to aid them in prosecuting the war against our enemies. The understanding is that anything left over of the supplies we give away, after the war is over will be returned to us. Being materials of war little of value will remain to be returned.

The fact is, the amount of war aid in the form of materials, services, and so forth, that we have received and can expect to receive from the countries receiving lend-lease from us is and will be at best piddling compared with what we have given and will give them. The difference between what we give and what we receive will be and is so great that the true term to designate this scheme should be give away and not lend-lease.

If the American people want to give their labor and substance away, as this plan does, that is one thing, but to deceive them into believing that we are getting economic value equal, or even remotely equal, to that which we give out, that is quite another. It is a crime.

There is no precedent for give away.

It was farfetched, to say the least, for Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, to point to the old historic practice of England of paying subsidies to her allies, as a precedent for the outright gifts we make to other nations in the name of lend-lease. The subsidies and "subsidy treaties" England made to and with her many allies from the 14th to the 19th century had nothing whatever in common with lend-lease. Those subsidies were not only quid pro quo bargains but from what I know about them and the financial history of England, they were preeminent quid pro quo bargains. They involved specific exchange contracts. Each party to the contract obligated itself to deliver to the other something definite. The following examples of her subsidy arrangements show how

exacting England was in her bargaining terms:

In April 1793 Granville signed with the Sardinian ambassador a treaty granting that kingdom during the war a subsidy of 200,000 pounds yearly, conditional on the maintenance of a Sardinian army of 50,000. (Ward & Gooch, p. 238.)

By the treaty with Prussia of April 19, 1794, Prussia was to supply an army of 62,000 men against France. In return, England and the United Provinces (Holland) were to pay her 50,000 pounds monthly. (Ward & Gooch, p. 246.)

If it is true, as we read in the Cambridge History of Foreign Policy, that the "series of subsidy treaties * * * is perhaps the most long-lived feature of British foreign policy," then it would indeed be an odd state of affairs if the pound sign was not present somewhere in every one of those transactions. Think of England, preeminent in financial integrity and management for a thousand years, ever failing to drive a hard bargain with her allies.

It was absurd for Mr. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, to say to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

The first lend-lease in history was lend-lease from Britain to ourselves when she lend-leased to us shore batteries which were designed for the defense of American coasts in the quasi war with France in 1799.

Lend-lease—

He said further—

is not a new thing; it is a quite old thing.

And then added:

Though ours happens to be its most spectacular illustration.

Spectacular, indeed. Sixty billion dollars' worth of American labor, and we do not know how much more, an amount equal to at least one-fifth of the labor required to produce the total wealth accumulated in our country over a period of more than 3 centuries, has been appropriated by the Congress to be given away. It is to be given away to a billion and a half people, nearly three-fourths of the total population of the world, scattered over the whole earth, and occupying three-fourths of the land area of the entire globe. More than 16.5 billions of this labor has already been allocated, more than 12.5 billions obligated, upward of 10 billions given away, and is being given away at the rate of 9 or 10 billions annually.

No; there has never been but one lend-lease, and there probably never will be another, for it is doubtful if the world will ever be able to stand another.

ADMINISTRATION WITNESSES WANT GIVE-AWAY PRESENTLY AND AS A PERMANENT POLICY FOR A VARIETY OF POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL PURPOSES

Mr. Stettinius, Administrator for Lend-Lease, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, approved wholeheartedly the idea of using lend-lease as a vehicle for post-war planning, as well as for the winning of the war.

Major Spiegelburg, recorder, General Purchasing Board, United States Army, said he thought lend-lease should continue after the war; that—

It is the greatest hope for lasting peace.

Mr. Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, gave strong approval to using lend-lease as a peace measure, as well as—
an indispensable instrument of foreign policy. Many aspects of the arrangement—

He said—

made for mutual aid, through lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse, call for extended negotiations with foreign governments vitally affecting our political and economic relations with them.

Mr. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, told the committee we should not forget our lend-lease expenditures at the international bargaining counter. He expressed himself as being in favor of give-away before we were formally in the war as a permanent policy.

AGREEMENTS WITH GIVE-AWAY COUNTRIES ARE NOT TRUE CONTRACTS

The following, taken from the master agreement with the Soviet Union, shows on its face the folly of considering this agreement as a contract in the sense the term contract is commonly used.

And whereas the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are mutually desirous of concluding now a preliminary agreement in regard to the provision of defense aid and in regard to certain considerations which shall be taken into account in determining such terms and conditions and the making of such an agreement has been in all respects duly authorized, and all acts, conditions, and formalities which it may have been necessary to perform, fulfill, or execute prior to the making of such an agreement in conformity with the laws either of the United States of America or of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have been performed, fulfilled, or executed as required;

And whereas it is expedient that the final determination of the terms and conditions upon which the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics receive such aid and of the benefits to be received by the United States of America in return therefor should be deferred until the extent of the defense aid is known and until the progress of events makes clearer the final terms and conditions and benefits which will be in the mutual interests of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and will promote the establishment and maintenance of world peace.

All these words mean is that the head of the United States Government now agrees with the head of the Russian Government that the United States will make a gift to Russia of war materials, and they also agree now with each other that at some unknown time in the future they will again agree with each other on something they know nothing about at present.

GIVE-AWAY IS BEING USED TO CREATE A WORLD SUPERSTATE

Section VII of the master agreements shows how give-away is being used to destroy us as a nation and merge our existence with that of other countries, under some form of world superstate.

Section VII provides that whatever the other terms of the final settlement may be, those terms shall not "burden the commerce between the two countries," they shall "promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them," and they shall also "pro-

mote * * * the betterment of world-wide economic relations."

To accomplish each one of these three purposes the terms "shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the Soviet Socialist Republics," such agreed action shall be "open to participation of all other countries of like mind," such agreed action shall be "directed to expansion," which shall be "by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples."

Furthermore, the terms of whatever may or may not finally be agreed upon shall be "directed * * * to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

Finally the terms shall, in general, be directed "to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter."

If these provisions were made effective we would have free trade. Our workers would have to compete with the lowest paid workers of the give-away countries, and our standard of living would be lowered accordingly.

In answer to a question by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], member of the committee, as to how many other executive departments, besides the State Department, have post-war planning committees or groups studying the post-war world, Mr. Berle answered in effect that practically all Government departments and agencies have planning groups studying the post-war situation and that practically all of them are in contact with the State Department.

On February 8 and 16 I discussed on the floor the program of the planning cult to create in this country an economic and social order patterned after the totalitarian states of Europe. In both of those speeches I emphasized the great progress that this movement has already made and pointed out the dangerous threat it presents to our country. I also pointed out that this scheme is not limited to the United States, but that it is being made global.

In the 1942 Progress Report of the Planning Board, which report is approved by the President, we read:

It is therefore assumed that after the war we shall make our international policy and international private interests conform to our desires for peace and the elevation of human dignity everywhere.

Our foreign policy will have an important bearing upon our domestic employment program when peace returns. Through an extension of lend-lease we shall certainly help feed the starving peoples of Europe. * * *

After Europe's needs for food, clothing, and emergency medical care have been met * * * perhaps then our greatest opportunity to help others economically will be in Asia and in parts of North and South America. (P. 718, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Thus we see that the program of domestic planning is tied in with that of international planning. The same groups

operate both programs. And just as this vast organization used, and is planning to use again as soon as the war is over on an ever-greater scale, the credit of the Government to abolish what is left of our free economy and replace it with a totalitarian state, so they are now using lend-lease to effectuate profound changes in international relations and policies and establish some sort of world superstate.

Apparently this superstate is to be headed by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia.

We know nothing about the Latin-American states, as those agreements are kept secret.

The attempt of the administration in Washington to create a world superstate is recognized not only in the United States but has caused apprehension in England. The Washington Times-Herald of March 6, 1943, carries a news item from London in which Col. Oliver Stanley, Colonial Secretary, addressing a large meeting at Oxford, is quoted as saying:

International cooperation in post-war reconstruction would be essential but did not mean international administration of the British colonies.

He said further:

I am going to confess that I am even more interested in what Britain thinks of the British Empire than what the United States thinks of it.

Indeed the statement of Prime Minister Churchill to the effect that he did not become Premier of England to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire was doubtless prompted by his recognition of the attempt to create a world superstate.

GIVE-AWAY IS A DELUSION AND A SNARE AS AN AID TO PEACE

Whether there will be peace following the war in the old sense of this term cannot be determined at this stage of the international cataclysm. Some sort of formal settlement, however, will likely take place. Transfers from nations to nations of ownership of and jurisdiction over large territorial areas will take place. As has always been the case in the past, the central thought in the mind of each group representing its particular nation in the settlement will be to secure for its own country as much territory and other advantages as possible from not only the vanquished but from its own allies as well. That is the law of post-war settlements; I know of but one exception to this rule, namely, the United States at Versailles.

When the victors gather around the settlement table after this war, the same spirit will prevail as has always prevailed where the spoils of war were to be divided. Let no one fondly imagine that the countries now receiving lend-lease largess are going to feel themselves indebted to the United States.

GIVE-AWAY HAS INJURED, AND IS INJURING, OUR WAR EFFORT

I recall that when the original lend-lease bill was before this House 2 years ago, its ostensible purpose was to keep us out of war. Lend-lease was to give

us a vicarious war; under it we were to produce the articles of war, give them over to other nations and they would do the bleeding. We were told that they had plenty of men, that they did not need our soldiers. I think there were few in this Chamber so naive as to believe that we could long continue such an arrangement and not involve ourselves in the war. It was and is unthinkable that some other nation will fight and bleed for us. Make no mistake, the nations fighting this war are, each and every one, fighting for themselves; we are allies in that we fight a common foe.

But no matter what may have been the stated purpose of and justification claimed for lend-lease before we entered the war, our entry into it altered so completely our position as to obviate every premise upon which the proponents of the scheme could possibly justify its continuance.

On December 7, 1941, Japan suddenly and treacherously attacked us and we were plunged immediately into a deadly conflict with that nation. Thousands of our soldiers were killed on the very first day of the assault upon us, and it was clear within a few hours after the attack that all of our forces in the Pacific, as well as our national interests in that region, were definitely in mortal peril. The greatest disaster our Nation had ever suffered from a foreign foe took place at Pearl Harbor.

It can hardly be doubted that lend-lease was based, in some measure at least, on the assumption by the administration, and especially the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, that the Pacific was wholly secure against Japanese attack, and that should Japan undertake to strike at us we would have sufficient strength available in the Pacific to subdue her within a few weeks or at most a few months.

Simple logic forces upon us the conclusion that the administration believed we had war supplies in superfluity and could afford to give the excess away. I cannot believe that the administration would have advocated the giving away of our war supplies had it been aware of the Japanese strength and the pitifully inadequate supplies our own forces had in the Philippines and other Pacific outposts to meet a Japanese attack. Indeed, Congress would certainly not have passed the original lend-lease bill had it been apprised of Japan's strength and our own weakness in the Pacific.

I cannot agree with Secretary Knox and others who still persist that we are fighting a vicarious war and base the need for lend-lease on the myth that others are fighting for us.

It is dangerous business to predicate any part of our war policy on this fiction. To do so cannot possibly conserve manpower, but it can frustrate the war effort and destroy the lives of our soldiers.

Have not we already seen the fallacy of this proposition demonstrated in the false premise and hope that through lend-lease our people would supply the guns and other nations would do the fighting?

It is now common knowledge that when the Philippines were attacked our

soldiers there were so handicapped in war supplies, both as to quantity and quality that they became easy prey to the attacking Japanese. Most of you have read of the bravery, the horrors, and suffering of Manila, Bataan, and Corregidor. The eyewitness accounts of men who escaped that hellhole are beyond belief. The despair and frustration of our poor, brave, bleeding, and starving boys when they finally realized, after all they had suffered, that they were to receive no help, are positive proof of the wrong that was committed against them in lend-lease. As General MacArthur so well said, no matter how brave, men cannot fight today's wars with bare hands. "Give us planes, give us guns; not 65,000 next year but 10 planes now," is what our boys were pleading then and what they have pleaded and are pleading now in Guadalcanal and New Guinea. How many lives, American lives, are being and have been sacrificed because of inadequate supplies and equipment?

At the time our Philippine Islands were attacked, according to the President's lend-lease report of March 11, 1942, the authorities in Washington had allocated more than \$11,000,000,000 for materials of war to be given away to other nations under lend-lease; more than \$6,000,000,000 worth was obligated to be given away; and more than a billion dollars' worth of modern tanks, planes, guns, and so forth, had already been given away.

You may say this is water over the dam—that we should look to the present and future and forget the past. That is true, but it is no less true that past mistakes should guide us in our future policy. Japan is in almost complete control of the far Pacific and every day is consolidating her gains there. Being to realize that there is a limit on what possible for our forces to attempt any large-scale campaign against her and they have been forced to fight a defensive warfare.

More and more we in America are conscious of lack of supplies, it has been im- this Nation is able to produce. We are reaching the place where we are feeling the pinch of rationing. We are reaching the end of our manpower and shall shortly be compelled to curtail the size of our Army or cut down on production. Already the production of food is seriously affected and likely to become worse instead of better.

Under lend-lease American goods have been distributed over the whole earth. Forty-six nations are eligible to receive these gifts, though only a few of these nations are actually engaged in the war. We may shortly come to realize that goods intended as war aid have been scattered so widely and spread so thinly as to be ineffective anywhere.

One more important point: The lavish giving away to people all over the earth of billions upon billions of dollars' worth of American goods under lend-lease has its ultimate source in the New Deal money delusion—the confusing of money with goods and production—the mistaking of figures on pieces of paper with the Government stamp on them as representing not only resources and capacity

to produce but illimitable resources and capacity to produce.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I favor this bill for the same reasons I supported the original Lease-Lend Act. It is better to spend dollars in the price of food and equipment sent to our Allies than to spend blood. The more material aid we give the more lives we will save. There can be no comparison in value between money and our boys who are doing such a magnificent job on all fighting fronts.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said here today and yesterday about lend-lease in reverse, but little has been said about what benefits have been derived from lend-lease in the way of saving the lives of our boys. It is obvious to me that the more material and equipment and other aid that we give to our Allies the better they will be able to fight the enemy and there will be that much less left for the American boys to do, therefore a consequent saving in the lives of our American boys.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass unanimously because of the renewed hope and confidence it will give our people in their Congress. It is apparent that many of our people are confused between what Congress is doing for the war effort and what it is doing on domestic legislation. Many think that the differences of opinion on policies affecting the home front extend to the war effort. This is not true and anything we do to dispel these fears will strengthen the morale of our people and give renewed hope to the farmer who is doing so much to produce the necessary food.

Lastly, it is important that we be unanimous in this vote because of the confidence it will give our Allies. The United States never has double-crossed any nation and never will.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

WILL THERE BE ANY FOOD FOR LEND-LEASE?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, since we are discussing lease-lend and the appropriations incident to its continuation, I wish to call your attention to the fact that if we do not correct some of our domestic procedures, we will not be in a position to furnish much food for lease-lend. We might do well to produce a sufficient amount of food to fulfill the needs of our armed forces and our own citizens. This is especially true when we haven't fed ourselves for many years. You realize that for several years we have been on a food-importing basis and the food imports have exceeded our exports. By 1940 we were importing twice as much food as we exported. Now we are called upon to provide food for lease-lend, as well as to fulfill other food commitments.

Today I have particular reference to what is taking place this very moment in connection with the canning industry.

Representatives of the canning industry, together with a policy group from the

Office of Price Administration, appeared before the House Agricultural Committee last week. After the hearings, a conference was arranged whereby the canning people, the O. P. A., and the U. S. D. A., were to work out their differences. I understand that up to this time the Office of Price Administration still wants to dominate the situation and that the differences have not been eliminated. These differences were:

First. That the O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture had been dilatory in not arriving at the prices they would pay for the canning pack of 1943. The canners had been told what they must pay for their produce but they were not given any assurance as to what they would obtain for their pack.

Second. The fact that the O. P. A. insisted on grade labeling. This has been a controversial question for 20 years. The canners showed where this innovation at this time would hinder their production.

Third. That the canners must accept a subsidy program regardless of whether or not they are in favor of such a program.

For one thing, Mr. Chairman, there is no use trying to justify any procedure which leaves an industry, on March 9, without contracts for acreage that should have been signed up long ago. The food program for 1943 is being jeopardized. The O. P. A. is, in this case, rendering what is one more example of its disservice to the war effort.

Secondly, the O. P. A.'s requirements for grade labeling appear to be an absolute violation of the letter of the law under which they operate. I quote Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, H. R. 5990, chapter 26, section 2, subsection H:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

In public law, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, H. R. 7565, chapter 578, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, we find the following statement:

That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing.

Is there any Member of this House who wants to stand up and say that the Office of Price Administration is justified in insisting on grade labeling in the light of this quotation from the law? If you cannot defend the O. P. A. on this, I ask the majority at this time, why you do not curb this assumption of power? Whether grade labeling is desirable or not is a question that can be decided after the war.

This is the third month of this session. We have the Smith committee to investigate the bureaus which do not seem to be following the law. Here is a good opportunity for the Smith committee to get the O. P. A. under control before it

ruins the chances of a maximum canning pack in 1943. The time is short. We may not have time to bring in corrective legislation from the great Banking and Currency Committee, from which this legislation emanated but there is surely no reason why the Smith committee cannot get into action and get this situation straightened out right now.

Again I want to ask the majority, how much longer are you going to let the O. P. A. get away with this kind of a procedure? Some of this O. P. A. outfit still act as if they are more interested in making America over than they are in furnishing the maximum food production which we need so much today. They evidently intend to carry out their objectives regardless of the effect they may have on the canning pack of 1943. The Office of Price Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture both seem to insist that the canners must have a subsidy. As has been brought out before, there is some question as to the letter of the law in regard to these funds. There is no denying that most Members of Congress feel that the spirit of the law has not been followed by these agencies.

This is not the time for double talk. Small business, and the canners are many small businesses, receive little comfort in reading what this department or that department, or this committee or that committee is doing for small business when they know full well what the O. P. A. is doing to small business. I think the time has come when we might well spend less time in telling about what is being done for small business and, instead, correct some of the things that are being done to small business, which is evident to every one of us here every day.

Here is the story, then. An industry, an especially important industry as far as the food supply of 1943 is concerned, has to come to a committee of this House to present its case in an effort to prevent an outfit like the O. P. A. from putting two things over on them, which are both questionable as far as the law itself is concerned.

Mr. Edward N. Richmond, of San Jose, Calif.; Mr. Harry Cannon, of Bridgeville, Del.; and Mr. Fred A. Stare, of Columbus, Wis., who appeared before our committee during the hearings last week, are three of the most impressive citizens who have ever appeared before the Agricultural Committee. They made a splendid presentation of their problem. They sounded like real Americans trying to do a good job in an American way. They sounded like men who were sincere and gave every indication of being men who were patriotic in their motives. They were pleading for an opportunity to provide the food to win this war. They were practical men with an evident comprehensive knowledge of the canning industry. Representatives from their districts can provide you with information as to their standing in their various States. I had never seen any of them before, but I want to frankly say that they impressed me as being men of very high business standing. My interest is not only in the canning business. My interest is also in

the farmers who produce this food and in providing the necessary food to win this war.

In calling the attention of the majority to this situation at this time, I repeat, "the time is short." Plantings and seedings are soon to take place. If the majority does not remove the bottleneck, which is largely the O. P. A., they must assume the responsibility for this bungling. They must assume the responsibility of not allowing one of the largest food industries in our country the opportunity of producing food for war, lease-lend, and the consumers of our Nation. It is your responsibility and the question is, once more, What are you going to do about it?

This afternoon the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] have evidenced a very keen interest in the matter of food production. I can well understand why they should do so. You will find in the Appendix of the RECORD tomorrow statistics regarding the food production and consumption of each State. Looking over the list this morning, I noticed that the State of Massachusetts produces seventy-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total amount of food produced in the United States and her population is over 3 percent of the total population of the United States. In other words, she produces about one-fourth the food she consumes. Therefore, the people of a State like Massachusetts, as dependent as it is upon food from the outside, should certainly be interested in the matter of food production for themselves as well as for lease-lend purposes and the other commitments for food that we have made in other parts of the world.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was very much interested in hearing the gentleman's remarks. I may say to the gentleman that I represent the County of Middlesex, the largest agricultural district in the State of Massachusetts, producing perishable products, dairy products, and so forth.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlewoman.

I do not say this with feeling against any single person on this issue, but I say this to our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], because time is short. This is the fifth year I have been a Member of Congress, and I know better than he may think I do how much power the gentleman has. I know he can straighten out this matter inside of 24 hours. I have that much confidence in the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], would gladly be of assistance in straightening out this situation. He well knows how necessary it is to have it attended to very expeditiously, not only for the benefit of our lease-lend program and our other food commitments and to feed the people of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I feel highly complimented that the gentleman has expressed himself the way he has, but I am frank to say that I cannot plead guilty to the compliment. I may say, however, that, without entering into the broad question the gentleman has discussed today but looking at it from a broader angle, I consider the production of food to be one of the primary essentials in the conduct and the winning of the war. Men cannot fight unless they have food. They cannot work unless they have food. We must keep in mind the fact that our first job is to win the war, but within that over-all picture I think the production of food is of primary importance.

While I am just a layman, coming from a nonagricultural district, I am conscious of the fact that the people are not going to eat unless food is produced, and food is not going to be produced unless there are on the farms men trained in the art and science of farming.

I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman and others, and I will do everything within my power, without making any definite commitment as to any particular thing, which would be unwise, not to help the farmer but to help the farmer do what he wants to do in the way of producing the food so essential to the winning of the war.

In relation to the gentleman's observation today, I shall be very glad to send his remarks as they will appear in the Record tomorrow to Senator Brown, the Administrator in the Office of Price Administration, and ask him to give special consideration and attention to the remarks the gentleman has just made.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I realize that Senator Brown has done much to cure the ills in the Office of Price Administration. No man can expect any individual to take as many people who were as "haywire" as they were and get them on a basis of sanity in a minute. You must give the gentleman time. The only reason I call on the gentleman from Massachusetts at this time is that Mr. Brown is a busy man. He may not realize the seriousness of this situation. I have confidence that he will try to iron these things out as we go along. This is something that must be ironed out right now. If the Committee on Agriculture had carried enough water around here they would have had this solved themselves without additional help, but evidently we have not up to this time anyway. I cannot say more than present the picture to the majority and ask them to do the operating for us; I cannot say less and live up to my obligation to the food program of 1943.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask this question for the Record. Has the Agriculture Department taken any position on the matter that the gentleman has discussed today?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not like to make only hearsay statements. Most of my information is hearsay, because I am not in the majority. As I understand it, the Agriculture Department and the C. C. C. are in a position where they see the seriousness of it and

are trying to correct it, but that the O. P. A. is more interested in making America over than in producing food.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, the gentleman has in mind the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; as I have heard it, the C. C. C. and Department of Agriculture are ready for action but the O. P. A. is holding up the program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to get whatever information the gentleman has in the Record, as to the position of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee would be able to do that. He will give you the attitude of the Agriculture Department. He is thoroughly familiar with this situation. As far as food is concerned, if we do not get action on some of these domestic problems, we will not be listening to arguments as to whether lease-lend is a one-way street or a two-way street. There will not be any food going down either street.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3 of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1943" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1944"; by striking out "July 1, 1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1947"; and by striking out "July 1, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944"; and subsection (b) of section 6 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947".

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1501, and had directed him to report the same back to the House, and that it had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] have permission to extend his remarks and insert an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial. I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost \$112.50. Nevertheless I ask that the matter be extended in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the Record an open letter to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CLARE HOFFMAN, and I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. HOFFMAN be allowed, following this letter, to submit his answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement from the Louisiana League of Clean Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a newspaper release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 75, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problem of Small Business the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee which was read:

MARCH 8, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with sincere regret that I tender my resignation as a member of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of National Defense Program in Its Relation to Small Business in the United States.

I am resigning from this committee due to the fact that my time is taken up with other official duties.

With best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

A. L. BULWINKLE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an article from the Labor News, dated March 5, entitled "Hobbs Bill Dangerous" by Albert Baker Lewis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

HOBBS BILL DANGEROUS—WOULD MAKE REQUESTS FOR HIGHER WAGES A CRIME
(By Alfred Baker Lewis, American Federation of Teachers, Local 189)

A bill that carries extreme dangers for the workers is the Hobbs bill now before Congress to make organized labor subject to the

so-called antiracketeering statute. The bill is particularly dangerous because it seems reasonable enough that labor should not be permitted to racketeer and to persons who do not know the facts that seems all that the Hobbs bill would do. But the wording of the antiracketeering statute is so wide that actually demands for increased wages, if the employer feared or testified that he feared, that there might be a strike if he refused to concede them, could be made subject to 10 years' imprisonment.

A CRUEL JOKER

For the antiracketeering statute reads that anyone who in connection with interstate commerce "obtains or attempts to obtain by the use or attempts to use or threats to use force, violence or coercion, the payment of money or other valuable considerations," is guilty of violation of the law and may be subject to 10 years in jail, or \$10,000 fine, or both.

If you read that carefully you will see the joker in it from the point of view of labor and of anyone who wants organized labor to keep the right to function at all. For the statute says that anyone who threatens to use coercion to obtain the payment of money is guilty. Higher wages of course constitute the payment of money. Unless the employer takes the initiative in offering increased wages you have to put some pressure on him and that is coercion.

If the employer says he was afraid of a strike and if a strike might interfere with his business or his profits, and all strikes do that to some extent, then there is coercion. If there was merely the possibility of a strike lurking in the background or present in the employers' thoughts and consideration as a possible penalty for failure to reach some agreement through the process of collective bargaining, then there is the threat of coercion.

WOULD BE GUILTY OF COERCION

Thus the union official or the union members who acted on the collective-bargaining committee or who called or participated in a strike, or who the employer thought would call or participate in a strike, would be guilty of coercion or threat to use coercion to obtain money, that is higher pay. Nor would a strike or collective bargaining in which the possibility of a strike was in the background be legal merely because it was not over the question of higher pay. For the phrase "other valuable considerations," takes care of that.

Thus organized labor could not function at all.

It is not too much to say that is the purpose of some backers of the bill, both in Congress and out. They are relying upon the antilabor feeling which has been worked up by men like Westbrook Pegler and Captain Rickenbacker to destroy labor organizations.

EQUITY AND THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it has long been recognized by all legislators who are concerned with the matter that a gross inequity exists in the rate of compensation granted to all postal employees. This is manifest in the numerous makeshift attempts since 1920 to remedy the unfair situation. They have been makeshift because they were applicable in almost all instances to what might be termed individual cases where the inequity was so glaring and apparent that some attempt had to be made to remedy the flaw. As a result we have had, over the last score of years or more,

various acts of Congress which first readjusted the salaries of fourth-class postmasters, foremen, and so forth—act of July 21, 1921; second, which authorized a 10-percent extra pay for night work—act of May 24, 1928; third, which authorized employment of postal employees in a dual capacity, if total compensation does not exceed \$2,000—act of March 1, 1929—this limitation has since been removed, and so forth. I am not criticizing these acts for what they accomplished, for, as I have said, they remedied, or attempted to remedy, single cases of inequity. I am rather criticizing them for what they failed to accomplish; namely, the correction of the greater inequity which covers the whole range of the postal system. We have applied a little oil here and there when a persistent knocking demanded that we do so. But we have not attended to the well-being of the whole machine, so to speak. Because the smooth-functioning and well-integrated machine which is our Postal Service has operated most efficiently and with a quiet steady performance these many years, we have taken it for granted that it is a timeless machine, something our observation should have demonstrated as nonexistent in this world.

It is true that the Postal Service has been the principal cause of this misconception. The ceaseless and careful performance of the service has been so persistent that we take it for granted. Their amazing fulfillment of the slogan, we might almost call it a vow, that "neither rain, nor snow, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers in the swift completion of their appointed rounds," their amazing fulfillment of this slogan, I repeat, has blinded us to the magnitude of the task they so set for themselves. I might almost hesitate to call attention to what seems so obvious if it were not for the fact that we do not seem to observe it. But it is an extremely difficult thing for man to fully realize the significance of what is an everyday occurrence. And this is why I say that the Postal Service has contributed to our misconception that it is a timeless machine, never in need of repair, adjustment, or even attention. For the undeviating devotion and the unceasing service of all employees of our Postal System has become something that every American accepts, but rarely appreciates.

I would like to call attention to the words of the act of February 28, 1925:

An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis.

This was 18 years ago, and I might venture to say without fear of contradiction that even then the readjustment was not fully equitable. But that is an old skeleton in the closet. We are not now concerned with the grim relics of the past. But in the grimmer days of 1932 and 1933 there came into being other skeletons, these with chains, which have continued to haunt the peace and security of all employees of the Postal Service. The first of these acts, which were anything but specters, was an emergency measure which provided that

employees should be furloughed without pay for 1 calendar month, an act which definitely placed postal workers on an emergency level, where, incidentally, they have remained ever since. The act of 1933, which superseded without compensating for the former act, resulted in a wage reduction of 15 percent levied against postal employees. Another 9-day payless furlough followed thereafter.

Now these reductions were based on a cost-of-living index, and as the Nation gradually revived, the reductions were gradually revoked, always subsequent to an improvement of the cost-of-living index. But this unwelcome companion who had dragged down the faithful servants of the Nation, without dragging down the effectiveness of their operation, left them behind in his ever-increasing prosperity. Like the proverbial faithless friend, if such this vague criterion can be called, the same cost-of-living index no longer had need nor heed for his companion of the darker days as he bulged and grew fat in the days that followed. Postal employees are probably accustomed to say, in that ironic remark, "I knew him when." And so, if we still have an unpleasant memory of the early days of the last decade, the Postal Service has the grim and mocking cry of "emergency" ever ringing in its ears.

But once again the word "equitable" is revived, as the realization of the inequity of the present situation is forced on us. A friend of the Postal Service, the Honorable Congressman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN] has introduced a bill, H. R. 1366, which is designed to amend the act of 1925 to provide compensation at the rate of \$300 per annum in addition to the regular compensation as prescribed by that act, as amended. An identical bill, introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; this latter bill has, as reported, added that such compensation be provided also to custodial employees, the men who work side by side and just as faithfully as all other employees. These gentlemen are taking positive steps to correct the inequitable situation.

Now I have made several references to the word "equitable." Simply defined, this word means just or fair. But I will make no attempt here to pass on the equity or justice of the present measure as stated. In the first place it is extremely difficult, next to impossible, to state what is a just compensation for members of the Postal Service. If we attempted to make a definitive appraisal on the basis of the service they render, the result might shock the unobservant. And further we must accept the fact that not by money alone can we measure the service they render. But more practically, I would make no such attempt because it is not demanded or even desired by these men themselves. They are content with the present provisions, not because it would be a bonus which they can use, but because it is a minimum necessity which they must have. They are probably more fully aware of the trials of the Nation at the

present time and the need for sacrifice on everybody's part than many of us. They do, after all, bring the bills, they do bear the bad news and share it too, all along the route. They know that Jimmy is in the Solomons and Bob is in north Africa. And they meet the demand for sacrifice directly every day in the ever-increasing demands placed on the efficiency and rapidity of their service. They recognize it in many other ways, too poignant to mention in passing, which have encompassed all of us today. If sacrifice is called for they can point with pride to the many sacrifices of the past, in addition to their sacrifices of the present.

But one thing is not called for and that is inequity; one thing is not demanded and that is the endurance of injustice. As quick as we all are to recognize the need for sacrifice, just as quick should we be to recognize that too great demands for sacrifice should not be placed on any one shoulder. I will not say that the Postal Service would fail or even stagger under the present and persisting burden which they continue to bear, for I have seen too often in the past their continuing efforts and constant devotion. But I do say that we should not continue to demand that their efforts and devotion be penalized, that we should not continue to permit inequity to parade in the cloak of sacrifice.

There seems every reason to believe that we will soon correct this incongruous situation, that we will quickly pass the proposed measure which has had so many voices of approval, and, to my knowledge, none of dissent.

But until we do, I feel incumbent to continue to insist that we do. And I think my friends in the Postal Service will recognize the need for this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILL TO WIN THE WAR

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. H. G. Wells, in the Star on Sunday, said the trouble is we are using slogans instead of really thinking. Before coming to the House, I heard such terms as "interventionist," and "isolationist." I had never been to the Capital City before. Since arriving here I am glad to learn that both of those words are slogans; not the result of thinking. I have found different techniques. One may have a superiority of technique, but I have found every Member interested in one thing—just winning the war. I have seen emotional disturbances where one man misunderstood another. I have seen folks called Republicans and folks

called Democrats, but all with one common thought. I believe we are thinking clearly. That is why the lease-lend bill will pass practically unanimously. I just wanted to make this brief statement, because sometimes folks misunderstand each other and there are words said in this melting pot; but those slogans should not disturb us. We are united in one purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 839. An act to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

You are hereby advised that the hearing on H. R. 134, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes, which was previously scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 1943, has been postponed until Thursday, March 11, 1943, at 10 a. m.

The committee will also hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

The committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 1, 1943, at 10 a. m., on S. 163 (H. R. 498) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1766, to transfer to the Department of Agriculture certain functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service relating to the fisheries industry.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 16, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

238. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

239. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons, at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

240. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting tables of bankruptcy statistics with reference to bankruptcy cases commenced and terminated in the United States district courts during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, prepared in accordance with section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2070. A bill to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named; without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2115. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 37. Joint resolution relating to the provision of butter for the patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 786. An act to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 2023. A bill to

amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 480. A bill for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2121. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2122. A bill to provide for a uniform method of payments to the several States on account of certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2123. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain aid to Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2124. A bill to further expedite the national defense by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, to diminish the causes of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2125. A bill to provide for the refund of all penalties paid with respect to the 1941 and 1942 crops of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the importance of farmers to the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2126. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Womble, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2128. A bill for the relief of J. Aron & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2129. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Christine Lund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2133. A bill for the relief of William Taft (deceased); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 2135. A bill for the relief of Albert D. Castleberry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 2136. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 2137. A bill for the relief of William A. Roberts, father of David Ernest Roberts, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the President and Congress to revise the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

237. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing Congress to relieve persons in active military service of the United States from payment of income taxes or gross income taxes on their compensation received from the Government for such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

238. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the safeguarding of livestock sanitary welfare and the livestock industry of the Nation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

239. Also, petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any modification of sanitary acts against the importation of meats from countries known to be infected by hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

240. By Mr. SCHWABE: Memorial of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri to the Congress of the United States, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act to the effect that any citizen in any county in any State thus organized under the Federal Social Security Act may be informed upon request made to his local social security board of the names of any recipients in any branch of the Social Security Department and the respective amounts of money each is receiving, or has received during the past year, and to liberalize the Social Security Act so as to remove the many limitations and conditions placed upon the States before they may obtain Federal funds, also to allow the States and local boards to exercise greater authority in the administration and payment of assistance to the needy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

241. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general secretary of the Anti-Saloon League of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sale of intoxicants to men and women in service uniforms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

242. By Mr. ANGELL: House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Oregon State Legislature, asking the Congress to defeat Senate bill 246 and House bills 1012 and 1115; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, on this holy day in the Christian year we fain would join the vast company of pilgrims around the world who reverently pass through the portals of Lent. Whate'er our name or sign, we, too, would follow the wounded feet of that Master of men who has invaded more realms, conquered more lives, taken possession of more hearts, swayed more wills than has any other figure across the long centuries. We, too, would gaze at that one Face set steadfastly against cushioned ease and cowardly compromise and which has become forever the living symbol of the might and majesty of meekness and of ideals and principles worth dying for.

For these weeks ahead leading to the gloom of Calvary and the glow of Easter, in the midst of our crowded and complex modern life, may we find some quiet cloister of the spirit, may we still the tumult a little, so that, opening long shut doors to the Unseen and Eternal, we may hear His voice. Coming to these days of the Passion with the sackcloth and ashes of penitence, may we enter with sincerity that we may come out with strength and joy. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON DEFERMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, March 10, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On December 15, 1942, I appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Paul Bellamy, chairman, Mr. Ordway Tead, and Mr. Eric Johnston for the purpose of making an independent study and recommendations to me on the question of deferments of Federal employees from induction in the military service.

This committee, after applying itself industriously to its task for more than 2 months, has now presented its report. For the information of the Senate, I am transmitting herewith a copy of this report and of the Executive order which I have signed giving effect to the committee's recommendations.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.